

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.
W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.

THIRD SERIES.

Volume IX.

WITH ETCHED PORTRAIT OF REV. PROFESSOR CHEYNE
BY H. MANESSE.

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXIX.
[All rights reserved.]

C. 61

E. 175

ser. 3

v. 9

189911

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

THE LAST NINE CHAPTERS OF EZEKIEL.

IN many respects the last nine chapters of Ezekiel (xl.-xlviii.) stand alone in Scripture for their striking peculiarity.¹ Let us first (1) epitomise their contents, and then touch on the two chief problems which they suggest; namely, (2) For what object were they written? and (3) In what relation do they stand to the whole system of Levitical legislation?

I. They are entirely unlike the rest of the prophet's writings. Those writings, which were doubtless edited in their complete form towards the close of his life, fall into four parts. (1) The first twenty-four chapters, after describing the call and commission of Ezekiel, dwell on the approaching ruin of Judah and Jerusalem, as a consequence of the iniquities of the people. With the exception of the judgment pronounced upon the Ammonites in xxi. 28-32, they describe the doom which hung over the Israel of the past, a doom which approached ever nearer and nearer as the prophecies advanced. Jerusalem, then as in the days of Christ, knew not the day of her visitation, and she was overwhelmed by that final catastrophe which ended for ever a great epoch of Jewish history. (2) Turning from the fortunes of Judah, Ezekiel, in chapters xxv. to xxxii., utters a series of prophecies against seven surrounding heathen nations. (3) The next seven chapters (xxxiii.-xxxix.) deal mainly with the future triumph and restoration of Israel and God's judgment upon her enemies. That this is the general idea of the whole final section is obvious,

¹ "Occupatus in explanatione Templi Ezechielis quod opus in omnibus Scripturis sanctis vel difficillimum est."—JEROME, *Ep.* cxxx. 2.

but (4) in the last nine chapters (xl.-xlviii.) the prediction takes a unique form.

II. Those nine chapters furnish a singularly detailed picture of the organization which is to follow the prophesied restoration of the people, and they were evidently intended by Ezekiel to be the crown and copingstone of his work. They were written B.C. 572, in the twenty-fifth year after Ezekiel and his companions had been carried into captivity with Jehoiakin, and therefore fourteen years after the fall of Jerusalem.¹ That quarter of a century of captivity had produced an immense change in the character of the Exiles. Jeremiah (chap. xxiv.) had already indicated the marked religious superiority of the banished Jews, had compared them to very good figs, and had announced their future prosperity and faithfulness; while he had compared Zedekiah and the remnant of "the poorest of the people" left with him in Jerusalem to very evil figs, and had prophesied their total ruin and rejection. The Exiles indeed, as we learn from Ezekiel himself, had been far from perfect; but in one respect they rose superior to their predecessors. The old temptation to idolatry was now practically dead. The high places, and other local sanctuaries, which so many of the kings of Judah had tolerated, or had in vain endeavoured to suppress, were felt to be as much things of the past as the Gillulim Matzeboth and Asheroth, which had been such immemorial emblems of apostatising worship. The prophet could safely regard the old guilty past as a *tabula rasa*, and could organize the theocratic institutions of a new and better future. These nine chapters are the foil and counterpoise to chapters viii.-xvi. As those chapters had drawn the gloomy picture of a desecrated Temple, a doomed city, an insolent and corrupt aristocracy, lying prophets, and a miserable people, so these set forth a grand

¹ In Ezek. xxxiii. 21, "eleventh" not "twelfth" is the reading of the Peshito and some MSS., and is accepted by the best modern critics.

and richly supported Temple, a sacerdotal government, a God-fearing nation. The increase and enlightenment of the restored tribes is symbolized by the vision of the waters (xlvii. 1-12), of which an English poet has rightly seen the significance.

“East the forefront of habitations holy
Gleamed to En-gedi, shone to Eneglaim;
Softly thereout and from thereunder slowly
Wandered the waters, and delayed, and came.

Even with so soft a surge and an increasing,
Drunk of the sand, and thwarted of the sod,
Stilled, and astir, and checked, and never-ceasing,
Spreadeth the great wave of the grace of God.”

Of these remarkable chapters—remarkable even in their prosaic minuteness and mathematical regularity—the first four (xl.-xliii.) furnish the architectural design and measurements of the Temple, its gates, porch, chambers, ornaments, and a description of the altar with its ordinances. The next three (xliv.-xlv.) describe the relations of the Prince, the Priests, the Levites, and the people to the Temple and its worship. The last two give the vision of the waters, and describe the position of the Temple and the Temple city, and the distribution of the land among the twelve tribes, with the portions assigned to the Prince, the Priests, the Levites, and the maintenance of the sacred service.

What are we to think of these chapters, which, as a whole, are less read, and, with the exception of one or two paragraphs, seem less obviously profitable, than almost any part of the Bible?¹

Are they literal or purely ideal? In other words, did Ezekiel really intend that his visionary sketch should be

¹ The difficulties presented by these chapters are by no means modern. Jerome says, “*Principia et finem (Ezechiel) tantis habet obscuritatibus involuta ut apud Hebræos istæ partes ante annos triginta non legantur.*”—*Ep. liii. 7.*

carried out? or was he merely throwing certain broad conceptions into a concrete and symbolic form?

1. Kuenen, among many more "orthodox" critics, still maintains that Ezekiel was intensely in earnest, and meant all his directions to be *literally* carried out by the Exiles on their return.¹ But the difficulties in this view are insuperable. It is impossible to work architecturally from verbal directions, and no two plans, drawn on Ezekiel's rules, are alike. His plans had no resemblance to Solomon's Temple, and quite as little to the humble structure of Zerubbabel. If they were intended to be followed it is hardly reasonable to suppose that they would have been so absolutely ignored; for though they must have been well known, neither Zerubbabel, nor Ezra, nor Nehemiah, nor subsequently the Pharisees and Boethusim in the days of Herod took any notice of them. No prophetic instructions could have been more absolutely disregarded. They were treated as a dead letter from the first. And indeed the entire directions about the division of the land among the tribes, if *literally* taken, would have been physically impossible and ludicrously unjust. The strips of land differ immensely in value, and some of them are hardly habitable. The *twelve* tribes did not return at all, but only a handful of families, mostly from Judah and Benjamin, who formed but an insignificant fraction of the entire nation. Further, some of the tribes had for long years practically ceased to exist at all. Gad and Reuben and Simeon had melted away, long before, into the mass of surrounding nomads, and

¹ Compare Wellhausen *Prolegomena*, p. 60, etc. "So long as the sacrificial worship remained in actual use, it was zealously carried on; but people did not concern themselves with it theoretically, and had not the least occasion for reducing it to a code. But once the Temple was in ruins, the culture at an end, its *personnel* out of employment, it is easy to understand how the sacred places should have become a matter of theory and writing, so that it might not altogether perish, and how an exiled priest should have begun to paint the picture of it as he carried it in his memory, and to publish it as a programme for the future restoration of the theocracy."

Dan only survived in the single colony which it had sent to the north. Ezekiel's distribution is wholly different from that of Joshua, and contradicts that of Obadiah.¹ It simply consists of drawing horizontal lines with a ruler between the Jordan and the Mediterranean. With total disregard of all physical features, and without even noticing the territory to the east of the Jordan, Ezekiel partitions Western Palestine into twelve strips, which are professedly equal, but which, owing to the greater breadth of the land southwards, assign three times more territory to Issachar, Zebulun, and Gad, than to Manasseh or Ephraim. Moreover the arrangement of the Temple "oblation" is geographically impossible, as it would have had to encroach far beyond the Jordan, which is excluded by the stated boundaries.² Ezekiel, consciously or unconsciously, places the Temple nine miles and a half from Jerusalem, and fourteen miles and a quarter from its centre. He wholly removes it from Mount Moriah, and brings it much nearer to Mount Gerizim. He makes its precincts a mile square, which was larger than the whole area of Jerusalem, and yet places it "upon the top of the mountain."³ The vision of the waters stands by itself in chapter xlvii. There is no very high mountain (xl. 2, xliii. 12) in the position described, and the stream, if understood literally, would have had to flow uphill, and over the watershed. This consideration should be sufficient to show that we are face to face with a dream or vision, representing an ideal picture. Nor is the particularity and tediousness of the detail any objection to this view, for it is characteristic of that total change of style which marks the epoch in which

¹ See Obad. 19, 20.

² Ezek. xlvii. 15-21.

³ Ezek. xliii. 12. In these measurements the "cubit" is taken at an average of twenty inches, but the general facts remain unaltered if it be made a little more or a little less. See Prof. Gardiner's notes and introduction in Bishop Ellicott's *Commentary*.

Ezekiel wrote, and the commencing decadence of the prophetic and literary spirit.

2. The wild notion that the sketch is all "*futurist*," i.e. a prophecy which still awaits its literal fulfilment, may be dismissed without further notice. It would involve a retrogression from the spiritual to the material, from Christianity to Judaism, from the Cross to animal sacrifices, from the freedom of the Gospel of Christ to the bondage of weak and beggarly rudiments.

3. Are these chapters then *allegorical*? Do they foreshadow great spiritual lessons derivable from the attaching of a mystic meaning to their numberless details? If so, never did any allegory more absolutely fail of its purpose, and fail even to furnish the least indication that it is meant to be allegorical at all. That view may be therefore set aside as a chimera which no one now pretends to maintain.

4. Are they then *symbolical*? That they contain certain general symbolical elements seems very probable. Symbolism was undoubtedly at work in many of the Levitical arrangements, and in the order, regularity, and unity of the land and Temple, as Ezekiel sketched it, there was a visible picture, to teach

"The art of order to a peopled kingdom"¹

Ezekiel probably meant his rules and measurements to add, in a subsidiary way, to the vividness of the intended plan, just as Dante did when he tells us that the face of his Nimrod was

" —lunga e grossa
Come la pina di San Pietro a Roma";

and that three Frieslanders, standing one on another, could not have reached from his middle to his hair. The detail and particularity are only ornaments of the general

¹ Compare the minute particularity of St. John's details of the New Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 16, 18).

conception. They belong to the literary art of *πρὸ ὁμμάτων ποιεῖν*.

5. But it would perhaps be truer to say that Ezekiel's picture is *ideal* than that it is symbolical. It is the fond dream of the exile respecting principles which he thought might find at least an analogous fulfilment, even if they could never be exactly realized. We have parallelograms everywhere, which faintly indicate the righteousness of Jehovah, and the symmetry and proportion of all that pertains to His perfectness. And everything is so arranged as to tend to the unity and centralization of worship. The Temple is to be magnificently secluded and magnificently maintained. "Holiness to the Lord" is to be visibly stamped upon all its ceremonial and all its surroundings. Its servitors are to exercise a hierarchical influence over the whole nation, and to hold a position of the highest dignity. Even the Messianic King, so gloriously heralded by more ancient predictions, vanishes before the Priestly Caste. No longer as of old is the King of the house of David to be, as it were, the vicegerent of Jehovah and the priests his servants. There is to be no prominent High Priest, and no powerful King, but only a sacerdotal order, to whom the Prince is more or less subordinate. In Ezekiel's ideal the nation has been merged into the Church; the Prophet recedes and vanishes before the Priesthood; and ceremonial takes the place of inspiration. Jeremiah, dissatisfied with the too superficial reformation in the days of Josiah, had looked forward to an evanescence of the old system, and the establishment of a new covenant. In that new covenant there were to be no priests, and no Temple. But the time for it had not arrived. The old covenant had not yet "waxed old," nor was it ready to vanish away (Heb. viii. 13). Ezekiel was a priest, and wrote with all a priest's sympathy for sacerdotalism and ritual. He establishes the foundations of the new covenant as it is given to

him to regard it, but with an ideal widely different from that of the elder prophet. The predominant conception of Jeremiah is that of moral righteousness and individual fidelity;¹ but Ezekiel can only conceive of these blessings with the concomitants of an established Church, an inviolable sanctuary, a richly endowed order of ministers, an elaborated ceremonial cultus, a holiness largely guaranteed by outward purifications and propitiatory offerings.² These he sets forth with all the laborious minuteness which is the characteristic of his method. And, so far from being an idle play of fancy, his scheme, though never even approximately carried out, yet produced a deep impression on the minds of his countrymen. During his lifetime he had to bear the martyrdom of hatred which awaits all precursors, but he illustrates a tendency which lay deep in the hearts of some of his contemporaries, and which, more than a century after he was in his grave, was embodied in those formal ordinances which are the essence of Judaism. The impulse which he began, and which was fixed by Ezra and Nehemiah, preserved the nationality of the Jewish remnant, and enabled them to carry out the work for which they were destined in the great Evangelic Preparation; but its exaggerated and exclusive development ended in the Pharisaism which Paul destroyed by the power of his reasoning, and on which Christ pronounced His sternest denunciations.

It will be seen then how momentous are these chapters, because they mark the transition of the monarchy into the hierarchy; of the old religion of the Hebrews into Judaic formalism; of the Prophet into the Priest. The new movement ended in the supersession of Priests themselves by

¹ Jer. vi. 19-21; vii. 21-26.

² How different are the tone and attitude of Ezekiel towards sacrifices from those adopted by the earlier prophets! (Amos iv. 4, 5; v. 21; Mic. vi. 6-8, Isa. i. 11-14, etc.)

Rabbis and Scribes. The study of this section of Ezekiel is as necessary for the understanding of the reformation wrought by Ezra and Nehemiah, as the study of those books is necessary for the understanding of the Oral Tradition, the Externalism, and the idolatry of the letter, which reached their zenith in Pharisaism, and which were finally crystallized in the Talmudic system.

III. But even now we have not exhausted the historic and critical importance of these chapters, nor have we even touched on the yet more curious and difficult problems which they suggest.

For when we examine more closely this reconstruction of Judaism by the idealizing imagination of an exile who was unfettered by tradition and out of contact with realities, it is found that these eight chapters abound with verbal resemblances and coincidences to certain chapters of Leviticus, so close and so numerous that only the blind tenacity of a desperate foregone conclusion can still pretend to maintain that the documents are entirely independent of each other. Even those who still think it necessary to argue that there is nothing but fortuitous resemblance between certain parts of 2 Peter and certain paragraphs of Josephus will not and cannot attempt to deny that the supposition of independent and fortuitous resemblance between Ezekiel xl.-xlviii. and Leviticus xvii.-xxvi. is absurd. This section of Leviticus has affinities to Deuteronomy; but it differs from that book in many respects, and approaches to Ezekiel both in its special conception of "*holiness*" in closest connexion with material worship, and in the use of a long list of words, phrases, and sentences.¹ A number of writers—and among others Vatke, George, Hupfeld, Knobel, Reuss, Lagarde,

¹ Wellhausen, l.c., 378. Colenso, *Pentateuch and Joshua* vi. 3-23. Horst, *Lev. und Hezekiel*, pp. 72-77. Smend, *Ezechiel* pp. xxv., xxvi. "Diese Uebereinstimmung ist um so gewichtiger als sie grossentheils eine wörtliche ist, und zwar im Worten die sich zu einem grossen Theil sonst nirgends in A.T. finden."

Graf, Wellhausen, Colenso, Kuenen, Smend, Horst, Robertson Smith—have sifted and examined these coincident phrases, and have formed their own conclusions respecting them; but neither they nor any other competent and honest critic has attempted to deny their existence. Hence these chapters have been called by Orth “the key to the criticism of the Old Testament”; and on the final interpretation of the phenomena which they present must depend in some measure our view of the true sequence of the religious history of the Jews. There have been various hypotheses to account for them, and for the peculiarities of Ezekiel in general.

An English writer in the *Monthly Magazine* of May, 1798, came to the conclusion that the last nine chapters of Ezekiel are spurious. Zunz¹ went further, and doubted the genuineness of the entire book, which he considered to have been written B.C. 440–400. He argued from special predictions, from the allusions to Daniel, from the mention of the wine of Halybon,² from the inconceivability of supposing that Ezekiel, in B.C. 572, could have ventured to propose a new Law and a new distribution of the land, and from various grammatical and linguistic peculiarities. He was strengthened in his view by the facts that (1) the Talmud asserts that the men of the Great Synagogue “wrote” Ezekiel,³ and that (2) the canonicity of the book was still disputed by the Jews at the close of the first century after Christ.⁴ It is needless now to examine this hypothesis, because it breaks down under overwhelming proofs of the genuineness of the book, and Zunz has, in fact, found no followers.

¹ *Gottesd. Vort.*, 157–162, 1832. *Gesammelte Schriften*, 226–233, 1878.

² Ezek. xxvii. 18, “The wine of Chalybon in Syria was a favourite luxury of the Persian kings.”

³ *Bava Bathra*, 15, 1.

⁴ In *Shabbath*, f. 13. 2 we are told that the Book of Ezekiel would have been suppressed for its contradictions to the Law, but for Hananiah ben Hishiah, who after long lucubrations reconciled the discrepancies.

But in 1866 Graf called closer attention to the similarities between Ezekiel and Leviticus xviii.-xxvi.;¹ and though his views were for a long time somewhat superciliously rejected and airily condemned, the attention of later critics was called to the phenomena which he pointed out, and various theories have been suggested to account for them.

1. Some have argued that Ezekiel copied from Leviticus, and this will probably be the only view which will be accounted "orthodox." To this view we will return later on, only remarking that God knows of no orthodoxy except the truth, and that the attempt to identify orthodoxy, without examination, with preconceived and purely traditional opinions is rooted in cowardice, and has been prolific of casuistry and disaster.

2. Graf argued, on the other hand, that Ezekiel was the actual author of that part of the "Priestly Codex," which is contained in those chapters of Leviticus.² His view has been ably supported with some modifications in the monograph of L. Horst.³

In forming this conclusion, Graf was actuated too exclusively by linguistic considerations, which can never be fully valid apart from historic examination. For if there are close resemblances of style between these sections of Leviticus and Ezekiel, there are, as Kuenen points out, remark-

¹ See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 11. Eng. trans.

The resemblances are most numerous between Ezekiel and Lev. xxvi. Colenso (vi. 3 ff.) counts thirty which occur nowhere else in the Bible, and Smend says, "Lev. xxvi. ist wesentlich eine Composition aus ezechielschen Redensarten," p. xxvi.

² The name of "The Priestly Codex" is given not only to these chapters of Leviticus, but also to parts of the Books of Exodus and Numbers which deal with worship and priestly functions; but it is fully admitted by the critics that it contains elements older than the Exile. It is obvious at once that Lev. xviii.-xxiii. with xxv., xxvi., differ in style from Lev. i.-xvi. and xxvii. See Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii., p. 183.

³ On Lev. xvii.-xxvi. and Ezekiel (Colmar, 1881).

able differences of legislation.¹ Thus the Temple of Ezekiel has only doors, while that of Leviticus has a curtain (Lev. xxi. 23, Ezek. xli. 23). Ezekiel does not so much as mention a High Priest (Lev. xxi. 10), and speaks of the sons of *Zadok*, not of the sons of *Aaron* in general. Most strange of all, Ezekiel seems deliberately to pass over if he does not exclude the Day of Atonement with its complex and deeply symbolic ritual (Lev. xxvi. 23-32, xxv. 9).² He also leaves unnoticed the feast of Pentecost and the sheaf of the firstfruits (Lev. xxiii. 10-14), while he prescribes other sacrifices; nor does he mention the use of wine at the sacrifices (Lev. xxiii. 13). On any hypothesis Ezekiel works with an independence truly amazing, if he was fully aware of the institutions now enshrined in the Pentateuch. Thus, he not only ignores the High Priest, but represents "the prince" as performing some of his functions,³ and in exalting the descendants of *Zadok*, degrades the Levites into a position altogether inferior.⁴ As though their *general* inferiority had not been recognised in the Mosaic legislation, a special and modern reason is assigned for their future subordination. In the division of the land not a syllable is said about their forty-eight cities, or even about the Refuge cities. Ezekiel sets to work as though Moses, as we have hitherto regarded his institutions, had never existed. It is strange that if the Pentateuch, or even considerable portions of Exodus, Numbers, and

¹ See Reuss, *Gesch. d. Alten Testaments*, p. 253. Rashi points to Ezek. xlv. 31, xlv. 20, as contradictions to the Law.

² It has been argued however, that the language of xli. 3—where the angel only enters the Holiest Place—implies Ezekiel's recognition of a chief Priest and his entrance into it once a year.

³ Ezek. xlv. 1.

⁴ Ezek. xlviii. 11. In the Book of Deuteronomy the name of Priests is extended to Levites, and the right of sharing in the sacrifices is conceded (Deut. xviii. 6-8) to Levites who come from distant places; but in Ezekiel a sort of compensation is given them for the loss of their maintenance and of sacrificial dues (Ezek. xlv. 10-16). In Deuteronomy we have the phrase, "the priests the Levites," but in the Priestly Codex "the Priests and the Levites."

Leviticus were in his hands, he should have ventured to prescribe an entirely different Temple, an entirely different altar, and widely different feasts, sacrifices, and priestly regulations. His views are all in the direction of those expressed in the Priestly Codex, but the differences between them are too great to admit of Graf's supposition, that he was the author of the section of Leviticus.¹

3. The only other hypothesis is, that these chapters of Leviticus were a modification of the ideal of Ezekiel by some priest or priests working in his spirit, but altering his regulations into accordance with the actual condition of the exiles after their return. This is the view which seems to be taken by the majority of recent scholars who have independently examined the question. They think that the true order of documents in the Pentateuch is Jehovist, Deuteronomist, Priestly Codex; and that the latter *regulates* the actual adoption of that centralization of worship which the Deuteronomist has *demande*d. The time has not yet come to decide on these questions, but meanwhile it is remarkable to find so eminent and stanchly orthodox a scholar as the veteran Delitzsch saying, "I am now convinced that the processes which in their origin and progress have resulted in the final form of the Torah, as we now possess it, continued into the period subsequent to the Exile."²

4. Knobel, Nöldeke, and other critics agree with the ordinary view in regarding the Priestly Code as far more ancient than the Book of Ezekiel. This is indeed generally admitted, as regards many of its elements, but the literary difficulties are still unsolved. How comes it that this section of Ezekiel is completely *saturated* with the language

¹ For other and *verbal* differences see *Smend*, p. xxvii. He says, "Trotz dieser grossen Uebereinstimmung von Lev. xvii. ff., mit der Sprache und den Gedanken Ez.'s kann dieser doch *unmöglich* für den Verfasser jenes Corpus gelten."

² *Zeitschr. für K. Wissensch.*, 1880.

of one particular section of Leviticus, and of that section only? How comes it that the prophet legislates for the future in a way which was totally disregarded, and which presents so many divergences from all other parts of the Mosaic legislation, and even from the very chapter to which he presents so close an affinity? Above all, what is the relation of Ezekiel in general to Leviticus xxvi., in which both the thoughts and the language are so remarkably akin?¹ Is it possible to entertain the suggestion that the authors of both sections were working on some common and older document?

I do not think that the time is at all ripe for any final decision of the questions thus raised; but few of those who have studied the results of modern criticism, and who know the extent to which they are being adopted by some of our leading English scholars, can doubt that we must be prepared for considerable modifications of the traditional belief as to the unity of composition of the Pentateuch. Let me only remark in conclusion that such questions are in no sense religious questions. They do not touch even the outermost hem of religion. They are questions which in no wise infringe upon a single article of the Christian faith. Their solution can never be influenced by *à priori* bias, or by the loud assertion and thump on the table of ignorant dogmatists, accompanied by the oracular anathema that any one who thinks differently from them is "a heretic." The ultimate decision rests with the science of criticism alone. The great eternal conceptions which we derive from the Scriptures, and which make them more precious than all other literature, are entirely untouched by inquiries as to the age and authorship of certain portions of them. The eternal supremacy of the Bible depends on the moral and spiritual lessons which are to be

¹ Horst's book is written to prove that the chapters in Ezekiel are a redaction of the earlier sketch in Leviticus, which he also assigns to Ezekiel's authorship.

derived so richly and to so unique a degree from all its books. Our opinions as to the date or unity of these books may be inevitably changed by historical discoveries or by critical analysis, but as long as man's spirit retains the spiritual gift of discriminating the transcendent,¹ so long will the Bible continue to be the most precious treasure of the human race, because in it we hear—far more clearly than either in the inarticulate speech of the universe or in the articulate voices of other men—the intelligible utterance of the Word of God.

F. W. FARRAR.

NOTES ON THREE PASSAGES IN ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

1 CORINTHIANS x. 4: "For they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ."

It has often been remarked that St. Paul's phraseology is here probably determined by a Jewish legend respecting the well which the Israelites are related in Numbers xxi. 16 ff. to have dug upon their arrival at the border of Moab. The Targum of Onqelos exhibits to us this legend in its genesis. The passage referred to describes how the Israelites, upon reaching a place called Beer, dug a well there to the words of a song, which is quoted; and the song is followed, somewhat abruptly, by a continuation of their itinerary, the names in which, as well that of the place Beer, happen to be significant in Hebrew: thus, "(16) And thence (they journeyed) to Beer (*well*): that is the well whereof the LORD said unto Moses, Gather the people together, and I will give them water. (17) Then sang Israel this song:

¹ καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα.—Rom. ii. 18.

Spring up, O well; sing ye to it:

- (18) The well which the princes digged,
Which the nobles of the people delved,
With the sceptre, and with their staves.

And from the wilderness to Mattanah (*gift*): (19) and from Mattanah to Nahaliel (*torrent of God*); and from Nahaliel to Bamoth (*high-places*); (20) and from Bamoth to the ravine that is in the field of Moab, the top of Pisgah, which looketh down upon the desert." The old Jewish interpretation of the passage, as found in the Targum of Onqelos, connected however both the first part of verse 16 and the words following the song, not with the movements of the Israelites, but with the *well*. We read accordingly in the Targum: "(16) And thence the well *was given unto them*: that is the well of which the LORD said unto Moses, Gather the people together, and I will give them water. (17) Then sang Israel this song, 'Spring up, O well: sing ye to it: (18) The well which the princes digged, which the heads of the people, the scribes, delved with their staves.' And from the wilderness *it was given* to them; (19) *and from* the time that *it was given* to them, it went down with them to the *torrents*, and from the *torrents* it went up with them to the *high places*; and from the high places to the valleys in the fields of Moab," etc. Because *Mattanah* happens to be capable of an interpretation in Hebrew, it was referred to the well, which was supposed accordingly to have accompanied the Israelites up hill and down dale in their subsequent journeyings! This however is not all. The well was further imagined to have been with them previously, and the office of the princes on such an occasion as Numbers xx. 17 was merely to evoke it into activity. On account, also, partly of the fact that immediately after the death of Miriam it is said (Num. xx. 2) that the people had no water, and partly of the similarity between the verse Num-

bers xxi. 17 "Then sang Israel this song," and Exodus xv. 21 "And Miriam answered and said, Sing to the LORD," it was attributed to the "merit" of Miriam (בזכות מרים). Thus we read in the Midrash Rabbah (a compilation some centuries later than the Targum of Onqelos), on Numbers i. 1: "They had the well through the merit of Miriam, as it is written, 'And Miriam died, and was buried there.' And what follows immediately after? 'And the congregation *had no water.*' And how was the well formed? It was a crag (סלע) like a bee-hive (!), and it used to roll along (כתגלגלת), and accompany them on their journeyings. And when the standards were pitched, and the tabernacle rested, the crag came and settled in the court of the Tent of Meeting, and the princes came and stood beside it, and said, 'Spring up, O well,' and then it would spring up." There are allusions to the same fable—not in Onqelos, but—in the fragmentary Targum, and in the later Targum of "Pseudo-Jonathan," on Numbers xii. 15: "And the glory, and the tabernacle, and the *well*, did not move or journey until Miriam was healed of her leprosy; and after that the people journeyed from Hazeroth, and pitched in the wilderness of Paran"; and on xx. 2: "And because through the merit of Miriam the well had been given, when she died, the well was taken away."

Further developments of the legend may be seen in the two last named Targums, and in the Midrash Rabbah, on Numbers xxi. 16–20;¹ but they are not worth quoting.² The entire fable is of the most puerile order, though scarcely more so than many other fables related in the pages of the Midrash. There is no reason for supposing, even if in St. Paul's day it had reached the extravagant dimensions

¹ The latter, in Wünsche's German translation, p. 475 f.

² It is to be noticed that the legend is based entirely upon the *well* of Num. xxi. 17 f., and is unrelated either with the rock (צור) of Exod. xvii. 5 f. or with the crag (סלע) of Num. xx. 7–11 (though it is brought into connexion with the latter by some later writers, *e.g.* Rashi; comp. xx. 13 in Pseudo-Jon.).

of the Midrash, that the apostle adopted or accepted it himself: though he does, no doubt, occasionally make use of a rabbinical interpretation, the adoption of such an incredible legend would be totally out of harmony with the masculine character of his mind, such as it is exhibited in his writings generally. St. Paul views the water which the Israelites drank in the wilderness as provided for them by Christ, in His pre-existent Divine nature, who attended and watched over His people, and whom he represents under the figure of a rock, accompanying them through their journeyings. The particular expression chosen by the apostle may have been *suggested* to him by his acquaintance with the legend current among the Jews; but it is evident that he gives it an entirely different application, and that he uses it, not in a literal sense, but figuratively.

Galatians iii. 16: "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

The difficulty of this passage lies in the fact that our experience does not suggest to us as possible a case in which either the writer of Genesis xxii. 18 or the apostle could have used the plural *seeds*. The term *seed*, like *σπέρμα*, has a collective signification, and thus expresses itself a plurality; so that the argument founded upon it appears to be nugatory. It is the merit of the learned Jewish scholar, Abraham Geiger,¹ to have pointed out what certainly appears to be the true origin of the—to us—strange *seeds*, and to have shown that the argument, if not conclusive as to the meaning of the passage in Genesis, was no far-fetched conceit on the part of St. Paul, but appealed to a usage with which both he himself and his Jewish readers would be perfectly familiar. Though *seeds* does not occur in the Hebrew Bible,² there was a case in which it

¹ In the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1858, pp. 307-309.

² Except 1 Sam. viii. 15, of different kinds of grain.

was in use shortly after St. Paul's time, in a connexion which justifies the inference that it was in use also among his contemporaries. In the treatise of the Mishnah *Sanhedrin* iv. 5 witnesses in a court of justice are warned of the difference between civil and capital cases in respect of the gravity of the issue: "Know that capital cases are not like cases which involve merely a pecuniary issue. In cases which involve a pecuniary issue, a man pays a sum of money, and is forgiven; in capital cases, his own blood, and the blood of his *seeds* (זרעיתיו) to the end of the world, depends upon the evidence of the witness against him. For thus we read in the case of Cain, who slew his brother, 'The bloods of thy brother cry unto Me from the ground.' The text does not say *blood*, but *bloods*; i.e. Abel's own blood, and the blood of his *seeds* (זרעיתיו)." In Hebrew, blood shed is commonly denoted by a plural term, lit. *bloods*; and the use of this plural in Genesis iv. 10 is taken to show that the guilt, not of Abel's blood alone, but of that of all those who, had he lived, might have been descended from him, rested upon the murderer. Whatever the worth of the argument in itself, the passage shows incontrovertibly that the word *seeds* was in use in the language of the schools to denote a series of generations descended from a man. It is true, the word used is not strictly the same as the Hebrew זרע, but it is such an immediate derivative of it, that it would naturally be represented in Greek by the same word σπέρμα. The same usage occurs in Aramaic. In the Targum of Onkelos, Genesis iv. 10 is explained just in the same manner as in the Mishnah: "And he said, What hast thou done? (there is) the voice of the blood of the *seeds* (זרעין) which were destined to spring forth from thy brother crying before Me from the ground."¹ And in

¹ Some of the rabbis explain similarly the plural *bloods* in 2 Kings ix. 26, 2 Chron. xxiv. 25. See the Midrash Rabbah on Gen. iv. 10 (in Wünsche's German translation, p. 104).

Onqelos the same derivative, זרעיתא, זרע, from זרע, *seed*, occurs repeatedly for the Hebrew משפחה *family*; e.g. xii. 3 all the *seeds* or *families* of the earth.¹ It is natural now to suppose that St. Paul, in writing Galatians iv. 10, had in mind the use of זרעיות as illustrated by the passage quoted above from *Sanhedrin*. The *seeds* with which he contrasted the single "seed" of Genesis xxii. 18 are not *contemporaneous* generations, but *successive* ones. The use of the singular in a passage where, according to the usage of his time, the plural might have been employed, appeared to him to show that the promised blessing was not to flow from an indefinite succession of the generations descended from Abraham, but from a *particular* generation, *viz.* the generation summed up in Christ. These considerations do not indeed make his argument a perfectly valid one (for they do not show, nor does it appear probable, that at the time when Genesis xxii. 18 was written, the plural would have been used in the manner supposed); but they relieve it of its apparent arbitrariness, and show that the apostle was simply speaking in language which to his contemporaries would seem perfectly natural and just. And of course the remark of Bishop Lightfoot, to the effect that the original word *seed* lends itself to application to an individual as a word of plural form, such as *sons*, would not have done, retains its force.²

Ephesians iv. 8: "Wherefore he saith, When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."

The passage Psalms lxviii. 18 which St. Paul here quotes

¹ The corresponding word in the plural (זרעיתא) is used in the Peshitto version of Ezra ii. 59, where the Hebrew has *their seed*, and the Septuagint σπέρμα αὐτῶν. The Greek σπέρματα appears to have the same force in 2 Macc. xviii. 1 (quoted by Meyer, from Geiger), ὡ τῶν Ἀβραμῶν σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι παῖδες Ἰσραηλῖται, πείθεσθε τῷ νόμῳ τούτῳ.

² The above explanation of σπέρμασις is accepted by Delitzsch in the ninth of his studies, called "Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ," on the N.T. in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift* for 1877, p. 603 f. In this country it has been noticed incidentally by Dr. W. R. Smith, in the *Academy*, 1877, p. 299, but does not appear to have attracted sufficiently the attention of commentators.

has, as is well known, "*Thou receivedst gifts among men.*" The Psalm, as may fairly be inferred from ver. 4 "*Cast up a way* for him that rideth *through the deserts*," was written in view of the approaching return of the people from Babylon (comp. Isa. xl. 3 "*Make straight in the desert* (same word) *a high way* for our God"; also lvii. 14, lxii. 10, where the same phrase *cast up a way* is used); and its buoyant and jubilant tone is an echo, no doubt, of the feelings evoked among patriotic Israelites by the prospect of deliverance. In vers. 7-10 the Psalmist reviews the glories of the past—the progress through the wilderness, the triumphant occupation of Canaan, and defeat of the kings who from time to time arose to contest its possession with the Israelites, culminating in the choice of Zion as the abode of Jehovah, and His solemn entry into it: for in these glories he sees a type and pledge of the people's deliverance now, and of their triumphant *re*-occupation of their ancient capital and home. In ver. 18 Jehovah's entry into the sanctuary on Zion is described under figures borrowed from the triumph of an earthly conqueror: like a victor, attended by trains of captives,¹ and receiving gifts from the vanquished,² or others who come forward in the hope of thus securing his favour, He ascends the hill of Zion: even the rebels, the Psalmist adds, are now ready with their homage, "that Jah God might dwell there" (R.V. *marg.*, with the Geneva version), *i.e.* might dwell permanently and undisturbed in the abode which He has thus chosen, and, as it were, conquered for Himself. But why does St. Paul change "*received gifts among men*"

¹ The expression, "led (thy) captivity (*i.e.* thy captives) captive," is to be explained from the Song of Deborah—which is the clue to so much in the first part of the Psalm—Jud. v. 12 "Arise, Barak, and *lead thy captivity captive*, thou son of Abinoam."

² The rendering "*consisting in men*" (Ibn Ezra, Ewald, Cornill) is also admissible; the reference will then be to the persons of the surrendered enemies themselves, instead of to their offerings.

into "gave gifts to men"? The same variation from the Hebrew is found in two of the ancient versions, the Peshitto and the Targum. In the Targum the verse is referred, fancifully enough, to *Moses*, and his ascent to Sinai to receive the Tables of the Law, and is thus rendered: "Thou didst ascend to the firmament, O Moses the prophet; thou didst take captivity captive; thou didst teach the words of the Law; thou didst *give gifts* to the children of men: but the rebellious ones who become proselytes, and repent, upon them resteth the Shekhinah of the glory of the LORD God." In the Syriac version the verse is rendered more literally, except in the second part, the sense of which is altered: "Thou didst ascend on high, and take captivity captive; and thou *gavest gifts to men*; and also the rebellious shall not dwell in the presence of God." Whether the rendering of the Peshitto is due to Jewish or Christian influence may be uncertain, though the former is perhaps the more probable: but in any case, the Targum shows that *gave unto men* was an old Jewish interpretation—or rather, as it cannot by any means be elicited from the Hebrew, an old Jewish *paraphrase*—of the verse, which, it is not unreasonable to suppose, may have existed as early as the time of St. Paul. Probably this will account for the form of the quotation in the epistle. The connexion in which the quotation occurs should be noticed. St. Paul is not arguing on the subject of the *ascension* of Christ, or quoting the text as a proof of it; he is speaking of the *gifts* bestowed by Christ upon His Church: "But unto each one of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." The text, as he wrote, probably came into his mind as a passage which, *in the form in which he was familiar with it*, described a bestowal of gifts upon men; and he quotes it accordingly, without stopping to inquire whether his

application of it was consistent with the sense strictly attaching to it in its original connexion. He quotes it because he sees in it, as understood by the Jews of his day, an anticipation of a particular truth of Christianity. The 68th Psalm was not understood Messianically by the Jews,¹ and verse 18 relates plainly to a *past* fact: at the same time, the ascent of the ark into Zion might not unnaturally be taken as *prefiguring* the ascension of Christ into heaven, and the captives and spoil, presupposed in the very fact of David's conquest of the stronghold of Zion, and imagined by the poet to form part of the procession, might similarly be understood to *prefigure* the evil powers vanquished by Christ, and, as it were, led visibly in triumph by Him on the occasion of His return to heaven. But if, following the same principle of interpretation, we ask what the gifts received among men may prefigure, it is plain that they cannot, without great artificiality, be taken as prefiguring anything except the *tokens of homage* rendered by men to their ascended Lord. Here then St. Paul, as he quotes the text, substitutes a different sense altogether: for *material gifts received among men*, he substitutes *spiritual gifts given to men*. On the ground of the rendering in the Targum, it is, however, reasonable to suppose that in doing this he is following a current interpretation or paraphrase of the verse, which made it suitable for quotation in the context in which he uses it.

S. R. DRIVER.

¹ Except ver. 31 (Heb. 32), which, of course, from its very form looks to the future, and is parallel to many passages in the prophets (*e.g.* Isa. xviii. 7, xix. 18-25; Zeph. iii. 9).

*THE SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF PRIESTHOOD
EMBODIED IN SUCCESSIVE TYPES.*

THE institution of priesthood is not peculiar to the people of God: there have been heathen priests in all ages, as well as Israelite or Christian. Races and nations, who have differed most widely in their idea of God, in purity of morals, in intellectual culture, and in social and political organization, have alike placed their trust in the intervention of priests for the worship of their gods. These heathen priesthods varied according to the character of the religion; for while some forms of heathen religion testified to the moral sense of mankind and the spiritual aspirations of man's higher nature, others expressed the abject terror created by the widespread prevalence of evil and by the mighty powers of external nature. But whether the sense of unworthiness or of helplessness was uppermost, the impression produced upon the imagination by the awful mystery of the unseen world prompted men to seek relief in the intervention of human mediators, who might stand between them and the invisible beings whom they shrank from approaching in their own persons. They cast themselves upon the superior wisdom or holiness of fellow men; and rested with an instinctive, sometimes quite a pathetic, trust on the mediation of human priests, who could understand their hearts, and whose language they could understand. Hence the fundamental idea of a priest, as a man who had power with God, and was willing to use this power on behalf of others. To this corresponds the scriptural definition of a priest, as "taken from among men and ordained for men in things pertaining to God" (Heb. v. 1).¹

¹ I am sorry to find myself at issue here with Professor Milligan. He writes in a recent number of *THE EXPOSITOR*, that "the fundamental and essential meaning of the word 'priest,' as used in Scripture, is that of one who has the privilege of immediate access to God, and is able to take advantage of it with

Sacrifice was the principal function of the ancient priest; for no other form of worship was considered in early times equally expressive of man's devotion, or so acceptable to God. There was no material difference in this respect between the Hebrew and heathen types of priesthood; material offerings and animal victims at a visible altar filled as prominent a place in the ancient worship of Jehovah as in that of heathen gods; and this ritual continued unaltered as long as the Jewish temple was in existence. Protests were sometimes made against this sacrificial system, like those of Psalm xl., "Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire," and Psalm l., "Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?" Prophets lifted up their voice from time to time on behalf of a more spiritual service of God. But the Israelite ritual had been rigidly fixed by law before the people were able to grasp the conception of a worship rendered in spirit and in truth; and it remained the same to the end.

1. The Hebrew Scriptures recorded however the existence of an earlier form of priesthood in the days of their fathers, which was essentially distinct in character from the Levitical. The most conspicuous representatives of this earlier or patriarchal priesthood were Noah, Abraham, and Melchizedek. The personal righteousness of Noah combined with his position as a father to establish his claim to rank as priest; he stood before God in a double capacity, as at once the most righteous man of his generation, and as

confidence and hope"; and that "the idea of mediation, of interposition with God on behalf of others, does not necessarily belong to the word." I take an opposite view, that the double relation, to God and man, makes the essence of priesthood. Christ Himself needed the incarnation to qualify Him as Priest for man, though He was already qualified by His eternal Sonship as Priest unto God. His office was to make propitiation for sins, and to succour the tempted; therefore compassion on the ignorant and those that are out of the way, experience of suffering and temptation, mercy and faithfulness to man as well as God, are set down amongst the foremost of His qualifications for priesthood (Heb. ii. 17, 18; v. 2).

representative of his children and his children's children; after the deluge he offered a sacrifice of thanksgiving on their behalf as well as his own for life delivered, and received from God in response a covenant of blessing for his remote descendants. The natural development of this family priesthood is perceptible in the time of Abraham and his sons; as a body of dependants gather round the head of the family, he becomes priest to his household; as the family grows in numbers, priesthood becomes the birth-right of the eldest son, and the hereditary dignity passes to the firstborn with the headship of the family. In this way the priesthood of the family expanded by degrees into the priesthood of the tribe. In Melchizedek is seen its highest dignity and most extended sphere, for he was at once king and priest; and his priesthood was recognised more widely than his sovereignty: for Abraham, who owed him no allegiance as king, acknowledged his priesthood by the payment of tithes and acceptance of a blessing from him.

This priesthood had none of the definite form and systematic organization which belonged to the Levitical. Nor does the Old Testament record any direct interposition of Divine authority by which it was shaped; but presents it as a spontaneous growth of natural religion, developed out of the relations of the family. Its claims to the respect of men rested rather on their willing acquiescence than on any exclusive privileges. Its sacredness was not maintained by jealous restrictions upon others' right to sacrifice. Cain and Abel, for instance, offered sacrifice each for himself; Abraham did not cease to act as priest to his own household, because he recognised an independent and superior priesthood in Melchizedek; nor did Jacob hesitate to build altars and offer sacrifice in the lifetime of his father Isaac. Throughout the patriarchal period men were free to erect altars, and perform sacrifices, whenever and wherever the spirit of devotion prompted them; though certain men

obtained meanwhile, by reason of superior dignity, wisdom, or holiness, an exceptional position and title as priests.

2. The Levitical priesthood was very different in type, for the legislation of Sinai abruptly terminated natural freedom and power of growth; the priesthood became from that time a national institution, bound up with the theocracy; the forms of worship were stereotyped by rigid rules of law, and freedom of sacrifice only revived on exceptional occasions, like that of Elijah's sacrifice, when the national worship of Jehovah had fallen into disuse or been abolished through the prevalence of idolatry. For the central idea of the Law was the national organization of Israel under the immediate government of Jehovah: and His actual presence in their midst, represented by a material sanctuary, formed the keystone of the Mosaic system. Hence the institution of a strictly national priesthood became indispensable. For this visible sanctuary required a permanent staff of ministers, invested with special authority from God as keepers of His house, guardians of holy things and places, conductors or assistants at the religious services there held. The ritual of sacrifice also, which was prescribed in harmony with the religious sentiment of those rude times, called for the services of a select company of priests: and it was necessary to invest them with peculiar sanctity in the eyes of Israel, because the worship was designed to be an important instrument in the education of the national conscience, and abounded in suggestions of spiritual truth. It was their office to pronounce with authority on every case of sin and uncleanness, to shut out offenders from the house of God, to prescribe and present sacrifices for atonement and purification, to grant absolution in His name, and bring to Him acceptable offerings of every kind from His faithful servants. In order to satisfy these necessary requirements a priestly caste was created by the adoption of the hereditary principle; one tribe was

selected for ministration, and one family of that tribe solemnly consecrated in perpetuity to the priesthood. The permanent separation of priests and people was thus secured, and their consecration for life hallowed them and their office in the sight of all Israel. This exclusiveness was a new principle to the Israelites, first promulgated in the Law; and the revolt of Korah evinces the strength of the resentment felt among the congregation who were shut out from all holy offices, and the Levites who were denied admission to the priesthood. But the principle served the same purpose as the exclusion of the people from the holy chambers; it brought home to their minds a sense of their own uncleanness in the sight of Jehovah, and taught them His unapproachable holiness. The particular choice of the tribe of Levi and the house of Aaron cannot be explained by any intrinsic superiority in holiness or zeal on their part; for Aaron was an inferior delegate of Moses, destitute of the high qualities that marked his brother for command; and though Phinehas and some of his descendants were bright examples of zeal and faith, others were equally conspicuous for profaneness and ungodliness. One instance is indeed recorded of Levi's zealous championship of the cause of God; but it was due apparently to the personal influence of Moses and Aaron on their own tribe, and was therefore the result, rather than the cause, of Divine selection. So far as appears from their history, both tribe and family were chosen in pursuance of a Divine purpose, without any special holiness or goodness of their own; as other families, tribes, and nations have been singled out from time to time under God's providence as His instruments for some special work. Future generations of priests and Levites were set apart before their birth for the inheritance of greater privileges and responsibilities than other Israelites; and even those who proved most unworthy did not thereby forfeit their position, for the holiness with which

they were invested was official and not personal. Meanwhile no personal holiness and no dignity entitled other Israelites to approach the altar, or enter the holy place; even the anointed kings of the house of David shared the exclusion of the people from priestly ministrations, and one monarch who presumed in his pride of power to intrude into the holy place was smitten with leprosy (2 Chron. xxvi. 16-21).¹

The most cursory examination of Scripture discloses the absolute control of the priesthood over public worship. The house of God was wholly in their charge, to open and to shut against any of God's people; day by day it was their office to cleanse, light, and order it, with the aid of subordinate Levites. It was they who kept ever burning the flame of Israel's sacrifice, and maintained the fire on the altar of incense. The congregation could not offer their morning or evening prayers with acceptance, unless the priest lighted his censer at the altar, that the smoke might rise up before the mercy-seat, and mingle with their prayers. All who were defiled by uncleanness, or burdened with sin, must needs repair to him for purification and atonement. All whose hearts were stirred with the spirit of devotion or gratitude to God appealed to him for his intervention in the consummation of their vows and presentation of their thankofferings.

And yet in spite of this Divine appointment and these exclusive privileges, it would be a great mistake to conclude that the Israelite priests played a chief part by reason of their office in guiding the destinies of their Church and nation. For it must be remembered that God did not

¹ Saul at Gilgal, and David at the entrance of the ark into Zion, are often supposed to have offered sacrifice with their own hands. But the history of the priesthood in those times, and the circumstances of each occasion, render it most unlikely that they dispensed with the services of a priest in making their offerings. The sin of Saul lay in disobedience to God's prophet, not in intrusion into the priestly office.

constitute them either rulers or guides of His people ; there were beside them other representatives of God who claimed an equally Divine commission from on high. A succession of rulers with various titles, differing according to the special functions entrusted to their charge, were raised up for the government of God's people in their early struggles for national independence and unity, such as Moses the lawgiver, Joshua the captain, Gideon the judge, Samuel the prophet, Saul and David the kings, all ruling in the Lord's name ; while after David followed a line of hereditary kings, anointed with holy oil like the hereditary priests. It is true that some priests were also numbered among these heaven-sent rulers, nor were there any stouter champions of God's cause against idolatry than the priests Jehoiada, Ezra, and the Maccabees ; but these rose to power by reason of their personal qualities as men of faith, and not in virtue of their priestly office.

Again, priests were not, as such, the teachers of Israel. They had no claim as a body to the inspiration of the prophets or the learning of the scribes. For prophets claimed direct inspiration from God ; they were listened to as bearers of God's message, and authorized interpreters of His will to their own as well as succeeding generations. The Old Testament itself was the fruit of their labours, and bears witness to the Spirit of God that was in them. And when in later days the spoken word gave place to the written, as the authoritative exponent of the mind of God, the scribes took the place of the prophets as interpreters of His will, and became in their turn the spiritual and religious guides of Israel. Both prophets and scribes numbered priests in their foremost ranks ; for Ezekiel and Jeremiah among prophets, Ezra himself the first and greatest of scribes, combined hereditary priesthood with their more important offices ; but as priests they were only ministers of the ritual, as prophets and scribes they were ministers

of the word of God. Now the ministration of the ritual became from the nature of the case formal and mechanical, because the ritual was from the beginning unalterably fixed, without power of growth or development, from the time of its first promulgation in the Law. The priest had no discretion to make the slightest change in the customs once delivered to Moses; his functions were purely ministerial. The result was that, in spite of the respect which his sacred calling procured for every priest who led a consistent life, the true leaders, reformers, and restorers of Israel, who swayed men's lives, and acted on their minds and consciences, were rulers, prophets, and scribes alone. Absolute as the Israelite priest was within his own particular sphere, that sphere was strictly limited to formal service about the house of God; and his Divine commission was constantly overshadowed by higher representatives of God, who either carried on the government in His name, or embodied His Spirit in words of power.

3. The New Testament reveals a far higher ideal of priesthood in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. So distinct, however, is the priesthood of Christ in all its outward features from any previous type, that a generation elapsed after His death before His work of redemption was presented under that aspect. For the first generation of Christians were Israelites, trained under the Levitical system, and imbued with the spirit of the Hebrew Scriptures. Their idea of priestly functions was necessarily formed from the ancient ritual of their fathers, to which the hearts of Christian Israel clung with unabated reverence and affection; and their experience of priesthood was limited to the earthly priests, with whom they were brought into continual contact in their religious life. Until therefore they beheld altar and mercy-seat visibly doomed to destruction, and the impending abolition of the daily sacrifice and the yearly atonement forced them to ask in dismay

what was to take their place, they did not connect the idea of priesthood with Christ, though they knew Him as their Prophet and their King. Then at last God revealed to them that the priesthood, which they beheld passing away, was but a shadow of the real, and that the substance remained unchanged and unchangeable in the person of their Eternal High Priest, enthroned beside His Father in heaven.¹

It was impossible to arrive at this doctrine from contemplation of the earthly life of Christ; for this was not priest-like, but the very reverse. He was born a king of the royal tribe of Judah and house of David; He was, and He claimed to be, the true King of Israel, albeit a spiritual king. Again, He came as a prophet; even His enemies were constrained to admit His wisdom as a teacher and bow before His authority as a prophet. But He was not born a priest of the chosen lineage of Aaron; He claimed no special privilege of access to God's earthly temple; He performed no priestly function; He neither was, nor could be mistaken for, a priest in the days of His flesh. The whole Israelite conception of a priest as engaged in material sacrifices at a visible altar in a local temple must be dismissed from the mind before it can grasp the real nature of the priesthood of Christ.

For that priesthood did not begin on earth. His earthly life was a continual preparation for it, and that in two ways: (1) He was gaining fellowship with man as His brother in the flesh, being subject, like him, to weakness and to pain, enduring temptation, wrestling with inward and outward evil, helping the infirmities, healing the diseases, and forgiving the sins of men; (2) He was offering

¹ The priesthood of Christ is developed for the first time in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Many considerations, particularly its reference to the impending judgments of God, fix its date as written on the eve of the destruction of Jerusalem.

Himself as a perfect sacrifice, pure, spotless, undefiled, for the sins of the world. But just as the mediatorial function of the Levitical priest began after the victim had been slain by presenting its life-blood and burning the fat or flesh on God's altar, so also Christ's mediatorial office did not begin till He had finally completed by His death His work of self-sacrifice.¹ "If He were on earth" (it is written), "He would not be a priest"; for God had appointed other priests to present the life-blood of earthly victims before His mercy-seat on earth. Christ's office was to plead in heaven the sacrifice which He had made on earth of His own life for the lives of His human brethren, and make this a basis for their reconciliation with God.

The possession of immortal life was an essential qualification for this priesthood; for man is himself immortal, and needs therefore an everliving priest, not of this world, to satisfy his requirements before God. An unbroken line of mortal priests was well fitted to maintain the permanence of ministration through successive generations at an earthly temple. But an eternal high priest for man needed such a power of indestructible life resident for ever in his person, as was obscurely typified by the mysterious personal dignity of Melchizedek. Even Christ Himself did not fulfil that ideal till He had been raised above mortal weakness and earthly contact with sin. As the Levitical priest went through a formal death, and received a formal gift of new life from God, in the ceremonial of priestly consecration,

¹ Under the Law the duties of presenting the victim, laying the hand upon its head, and slaying it, devolved upon the person or congregation who offered the sacrifice, and were performed by them or their representatives (Lev. i. iv.). On the day of atonement and similar solemn occasions the priest performed these duties (Lev. xvi. 15; 2 Chron. xxix. 24). He acted on these occasions in a double capacity, as representative of his people, and as mediator for them. But the two functions are not the less distinct because on particular occasions one person united both. Christ in the days of His flesh offered Himself as representative Son of man, but He was not appointed Mediator between God and man till He entered into heaven itself.

before he was installed in his sacerdotal office (Lev. viii.) ; so Christ did not assume His priesthood till He had through death triumphed finally over every weakness of the flesh, and put on His immortality.

Again, the priesthood of Christ is essentially spiritual. God is a Spirit, and spiritual communion between God and man lies at the bottom of all true worship. Its outward forms may vary indefinitely, but there must be some real approach of man to God in spirit and in truth, or else there is no real worship ; for the value of worship depends on its power to effect communion of spirit with an unseen God. The most elementary conception of a priest attributes to him the power to bring men nearer to God than they could come without his aid. When once therefore the true nature of God is apprehended, it becomes obvious that no formal approach can satisfy the ideal of priesthood, and that the priest who does not achieve spiritual communion between God and man is reaching after mere shadows of worship, and failing to secure acceptance in the sight of God. Even the Israelite priest, invested as he was with a Divine commission, filled nevertheless a subordinate place to the prophet, because the spiritual intercourse between God and His people fell within the prophet's sphere, while the priest was concerned with men's outward offerings, and had no direct cognisance of their inner lives.

But it is not enough to recognise the priesthood of Christ as spiritual ; it is necessary to consider further what kind of spirit animated it. For each successive priesthood has differed in spirit according to the different conception of God which it expressed. There was a marked difference between the patriarchal and Levitical priesthoods ; for though God was from the beginning regarded as the creator and invisible ruler of the world, yet in the earlier period He was contemplated as the friend of man, readily accessible to human gifts and intercourse, and at times walking

visibly with man; the growing sense of sin had not yet built up a wall of separation between Him and His creatures. The revelation of Sinai transformed this relation of man to God. It created multiplied forms of uncleanness, it deepened the sense of sin, it intensified the holiness of the God of Israel as unable to bear the sight of iniquity, and limited all direct intercourse with Him to a few chosen priests. Atonement for sin became the central idea of mediation, and almost absorbed every other conception of priestly functions; even the burnt offering, though presented by God's own people and most faithful servants, was viewed as a species of atonement. The sense of God's love was almost lost in the dread of His holiness; for atonement was fixed by an immutable covenant, and forgiveness of sin came no longer as a spontaneous act of personal mercy and love, but was claimed as the legal right of those who adopted the prescribed means of averting the wrath of God. Accordingly the dominant spirit of the Israelite ritual placed the personal initiative of worship in man, seeking by the appointed method to act upon the mind of God, to win His favour, or avert His anger.

But the God, whom Christ reveals, is not an impersonation of holiness and justice sitting apart in His majesty, but a heavenly Father of infinite love even to those who have not begun to love Him, whose heart goes forth to meet His wayward children when they are yet a great way off, who is ever waiting to forgive, and eager to bless. The initiative here is wholly on the side of God. Whereas the Israelite priesthood provided means for man seeking God, Christ came forth from God to win back fallen man; and no idea can be formed of His priesthood without taking account of this radical difference; for it involves a revolution in the idea of priesthood, when it is realized that the barriers which divide God and man lie wholly in the heart of man, and that the work of reconciliation has to be carried on

entirely there. The ideal priest under the gospel must plead with men's consciences, reassure their doubts and fears, pave the way for their return to God by the removal of every obstacle; he must win his way into men's confidence as the authorized messenger of God and the friend of man.

The perfect fulfilment of such a task demands a perfect insight into the mind of God and undoubted authority from Him; such as belongs to the Son of God alone, who is wholly one in spirit with the Father. Therefore the priesthood of Christ is in Scripture based upon His Sonship. It is said that the address of the second Psalm, "Thou art my Son," conveys to Him at the same time with the position of a son priestly rights inherent in that adoption (Heb. v. 5); and His Divine authority as the ideal high priest for man is made to rest on the fact that He is the eternal Son of God.

Again the ideal high priest for man must also possess perfect insight into the mind of man and entire sympathy with his spirit. Therefore Christ's assumption of the office was preceded by His incarnation. It issued out of this indeed as an immediate result. For when He became Son of man, and made Himself one with men in flesh and blood, He recognised their birthright as sons of God (however much God's image might be now defaced in them) with all its consequences; He was not ashamed to call them brethren on earth, or to present Himself before God in heaven as firstborn of many brethren. He reestablished for mankind all their rights, as members of the spiritual family of God; and they became anew sons of God and brethren of Christ. As brethren therefore they acquired a claim on His brotherly love; and His priesthood on their behalf followed as a necessary consequence from their brotherhood. For how can any true son be himself one in spirit with his father, and yet bear to see his brethren,

who are likewise heirs to the father's love, shut out from it! He must perforce set himself to open a way for their return home, and stretch forth his hands to help them onwards on their way to the father. In other words, Christ could not but become man's priest unto God by reason of the greatness of His love for man, as a child of God.

This change in the nature of His priesthood involves a corresponding change in the sacrifices which He presents to God. A spiritual priest must offer spiritual sacrifices. The sacrifices of the old covenant have each their Christian counterpart. As the Mosaic tabernacle was made after the pattern of a heavenly archetype (Exod. xxv. 40), so the ritual was typical even in minute details of a spiritual system. The most conspicuous instance of this was found in the yearly entrance of the high priest alone into God's secret chamber, to make atonement for the sins of his people; by which Israel had been educated to trust in the mediation of the one spiritual high priest who was to enter alone into the Father's presence on behalf of all His children. But now, instead of the yearly atonement and the many offerings for sin and uncleanness prescribed in the Law, the gospel pointed to Christ's one offering of Himself as an all-sufficient atonement. It left no room for any further sin offering; for it revealed most fully once for all, not only the Son's entire forgiveness of the sinners for whom He gave up His own life, but the love of the Father also, who had sent Him to die for sinners: and it was impossible to add anything to the force of this assurance. But though the sacrifice is finished and complete, the remembrance of it must be kept ever fresh in the minds of men; for it is still as necessary as it was in Israelite days that the sinner should confess his sins over it, declare his own unworthiness to stand in God's sight, and send up his prayer for forgiveness in its name. The enthronement

of human sympathy in the living person of a heavenly mediator, able and willing to stand between the penitent and the just consequences of his misdeeds, continues therefore a vital necessity for the restoration of the guilty. There is no visible cloud of incense now rising up before God's mercy-seat, and mingling with the prayers of God's faithful people, that they may find acceptance with Him; but the intercession of the Spirit is needed to help our infirmities, and our High Priest must quicken us with heavenly fire, that we may pray aright. Moreover Christ Himself, when He replaced burnt offering by an absolute surrender of Himself to do God's will, gave a clear example of the continual burnt offering which Christians are bound to render to God in Him. Christians again are even more bound, than Israelites were, to offer to God the fruit of the lips giving Him thanks, and to bring out of the means, with which He has blessed them, gifts for His service, for His poor, and for the use of brethren in Christ; these are the Christian thankofferings, to be made through Christ, *i.e.* with humble acknowledgment of their own unworthiness, and thankful remembrance of His redemption.

4. The New Testament presents one more type of priesthood, subordinate to, but inseparable from, the priesthood of Christ; *viz.* the priesthood of Christian men. The latter is the inevitable result of the former; for whatever is true of Christ as a man, must also be true of those that are Christ's. He undertakes no office in which He does not make His brethren sharers. If He be a king, they are to reign with Him as companions of His throne; if judge, they are to be seated as His assessors beside His seat of judgment: they are destined partners of His heavenly glory, as they are called to be of His earthly sufferings. It would be alien to the whole spirit of Christianity to conceive Him sitting in heaven as a solitary priest-king like Melchizedek. Therefore the Epistle to the Hebrews, when it

applies to Him the prophetic language of Psalm cx., "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," alters the words so far as to entitle Him, not priest, but high priest (Heb. v. 10). The risen Lord is not alone in His high office, but firstborn of the many children of the resurrection, and leader of a glorious company of human brethren, whom He has made kings and priests unto His God and Father. The inspired author of that epistle beheld in glorious visions the great host of the faithful departed, from righteous Abel downwards, first awaiting the death of Christ for consecration to a heavenly priesthood, then gathered as consecrated spirits round their Lord in heaven (Heb. xi. 40 ; xii. 23).¹

But this priesthood is not limited to the Church triumphant in heaven ; it belongs equally to the Church militant on earth. It is not a future dignity reserved for saints in heaven, but a present duty and existing privilege of every true member of Christ on earth. St. Peter, and St. John in the Revelation, are both explicit on this head : "Ye are a royal priesthood"; "Christ hath made us kings and priests unto His God and Father." Both speak of priesthood as the actual and undoubted heritage of all Christians. Moreover the language of St. Peter derives additional emphasis from its original application in the Old Testament ; for the words are not the Apostle's own, but are borrowed by him from God's address to Israel at the time when He admitted them to covenant at Sinai as a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. xix. 6). He then declared that He had chosen the whole nation, brought them nearer to Himself than any other men, and made them by His special favour worshippers in His courts, and keepers of His sanctuary, that they might become priests unto the Gentiles,

¹ In both these passages our version has unfortunately substituted "*perfect*" for *consecrate* : the latter is the correct rendering of *τελειοῦν* in all the passages of Scripture which refer to priesthood.

and that the world might learn through them the knowledge of God and of His holiness. I know no other passage of the Old Testament suggesting a priesthood distinct from the priesthood of the altar and the sanctuary. It contains the germ of a noble truth, which long lay half-buried and forgotten—for the time was not yet ripe for the comprehension of a world-wide spiritual priesthood—but bore fruit at last when the Apostle seized on it to remind the Christian Israel that they have succeeded in their turn to the priestly privileges and responsibilities of Israel; and that God has now chosen them out of the world, and revealed Himself to them in the face of Jesus Christ, that through them the light of His countenance may shine upon all who are now walking in darkness; and so all His children of every nation and every class may be brought near to Him in faith and love, and enter in their turn as consecrated priests through the rent veil into His holy presence.

The truth is, that the great heavenly High Priest needs the services of all His brethren on earth for carrying on His work of reconciliation. His plan of salvation is to make man the instrument of man's restoration. Therefore, as we read in Hebrews x. 14, He has consecrated for ever all those that are or shall be dedicated to the service of God.¹ He gives to every member of His Church grace to become His under-priest. He has indeed other means of bringing men to God besides the cooperation of Christian brethren, for He speaks to them by the voice of His Spirit, and the calls of His providence: but He does not rely on spiritual influences alone; He uses largely the living power and love of human priests, to reassure the guilty, raise up the fallen, and strengthen the weak; He breathes into them

¹ Our version reads here again "*perfected*" for *consecrated*. But it is not true that Christians are yet perfected; they are already consecrated, *i.e.* made priests unto God.

His own spirit of mingled holiness and love, and strengthens them that they may impart a like strength to others.¹

I find therefore in the doctrine of Christian priesthood a protest against the narrow view of religion which limits each man's duty to his own personal salvation, without regard to the welfare of other human souls. It is impossible to reconcile any selfish isolation of individual Christians with the spirit of Christ; no man can become a member of Christ without other men acquiring an immediate claim upon him in Christ's name to become a priest unto them, that he may bring them if possible as near to God as he stands himself. Christ has made us all members one of another, that those who are strong may strengthen weaker brethren, those who are wise may teach the ignorant, those who have come near to God may draw those who are far off. It is the law of His kingdom that every Christian should become by the aid of His Spirit a fresh centre of religious practice and Christian worship. He bids each of His disciples, as soon as he has grasped the hand of his heavenly High Priest, stretch forth a hand in his turn to forlorn outcast wanderers. By this ministry of souls He binds high and low together in the common service of their heavenly Father, weaving chains of human lovingkindness to reach down from His Father's throne in heaven to the lowest depths of earthly misery, until all God's children are embraced within the golden network of Divine love.

F. RENDALL.

¹ It must not be forgotten that in dealing with Christian priesthood I refer exclusively to the scriptural usage of the term "priest." The same word is also used in the Prayer-book and Articles, with a distinct meaning of its own. When these, retaining the language of more ancient liturgies, speak of the three orders of Bishops Priests and Deacons, they obviously employ the name to describe the primitive order of *πρεσβύτεροι*, designated in Scripture as "elders"; whereas the title of priest is in the Bible reserved exclusively for the translation of the Greek *ιερεύς*.

THE DEEP GULF BETWEEN THE OLD THEOLOGY AND THE NEW.

A LAST CONFESSION OF FAITH.

I.

THE more my earthly life declines, the more do I feel myself compelled to concentrate my strength and time on practical aims: even in the purely scientific work which falls to me in my calling as a representative of biblical science, it is a practical end which I keep in view. It has been my privilege to live contemporaneous with a bright period of reawakening in Christian faith and life, which has borne fruit in a splendid rejuvenescence of Church theology; and now I have been reserved with a few, to witness with them how the structure of half-a-century is being rent, and how what hitherto stood firm, and seemed likely to endure, is being undermined and overthrown. This must not astonish us overmuch. Such is the course of history, sacred and profane. After the wave-mountain comes the wave-valley; and when anything new is to be created, the form of primordial chaos repeats itself. Heaven and earth are fleeting, for they shall pass away; but they are also enduring, for they shall come forth from that passing away as new heaven and new earth. The Church's *credo* is changeable, for the knowledge which is therein expressed has from time to time a smelting to undergo; but it is also unchangeable, for in it is a truth which outlives the fire, and which, through all changes of man's cognition, reveals itself anew in ever purer and intenser brilliance. For just this reason however has the Church to depend for her maintenance and progress on the fulfilment of this condition, that she make herself mistress of the elements of truth implied in the destruction of what has hitherto been accepted, and that she melt them down with the truth

sealed to her by a higher than scientific authority. This is the practical problem towards the solution of which I would gladly lend my aid.

For thankful recognition such endeavour must look to comparatively few among contemporaries, because the majority of Christian believers will regard as invalid, or certainly as doubtful, the supposition from which it starts; though now-a-days scarcely any one questions that even the flood of rationalism from which the Church emerged victorious, left her fertilized by a sediment of knowledge. That, by such endeavour, one should earn but paltry thanks in the camp of his opponents, lies in the nature of the case. If we seek to unite what in the accepted views of modern criticism, appears to demand recognition, with that which is inalienable in our faith, we incur the reproach of an inconsistency which stops halfway, and are likely to bear the ridicule cast upon old clothes adorned with new patches. But this should not deter nor astonish us. Not deter: for when we consider how Semler's rationalism and Schleiermacher's entire reconstruction of theology have contributed to the advance of Church theology, we may find therein a guarantee that the latter will also be able gradually to assimilate the elements of truth contained in the present chaos. And it should not astonish us that those on the other side look down on us in their superiority. No process of assimilation will bring us materially nearer each other, for between old and new theology lies a deep gulf, which the former must cross to win the thanks of the latter; and this it cannot do, without approaching that sin for which there is no forgiveness in this world or the next.

II.

There is a unifying tendency native to the soul of man, by which his thought, speech, and effort after knowledge

are decided. Thinking or speaking, he arranges things in the world of phenomena according to common features, by which he classes them together under the abstract unities of notions. In his effort after knowledge he seeks for thesis and antithesis, and synthesis, which is the blending of the proposition and its opposite in a real and higher unity. Or, again, he seeks to force his way down to the radical unity, whence contraries branch out and develop. This monistic tendency is in its final ground and purpose a tendency toward God, the alone One. Since however things which have their common origin in God may be in themselves dualistically severed and in principle distinct, the monistic tendency oversteps the line drawn for it when it reduces antitheses that defy unification to different sides or degrees of an imagined unity. Thus God and world are antitheses which must stand; he who annuls the opposition asserts either, There is no world different from God, or, There is no God different from the world. Spirit and body are antitheses, which must likewise remain unreduced; otherwise spirit is identified with matter itself, developed from below upward to self-consciousness. Man is a duality of spirit and body, and as such is different in species from the beast; he who annuls this dualism of the human substance places man on a level with the highly developed beast.

In such fundamental contraposition stands also nature and grace. The nature of a thing is its constitution as fixed by creation and enduring by law; the nature of a man is his essential condition, created or inborn, and expressing itself in this way or that by morally responsible activity. Man's nature was originally good, but is now, through his wilful alienation from God, become sinful, fallen into the service of sin. But it is God's merciful will to free man from the self-corruption of his nature. He has appointed Christ, the Son of God and man, to mediate in

the restoration of our communion with God ; and grace is the name of God's action for us and to us, the purpose of which is to free us from the consciousness of guilt and from the ban of sin-service. The work of God's grace in Christ, aiming as it does at our deliverance, at the breaking of our bonds, at our salvation, is a supernatural work ; and he who submits himself to this can in his own experience distinguish the supernatural workings of grace from the workings of his natural powers and impulses. It is a very important matter, says Philip Jacob Spener, in beginning his treatise on Nature and Grace (1687), which he as chief court preacher in Dresden dedicated to the clergy of Saxony,—it is a very important matter, to which much pertains for the exercise of true Christianity and the knowledge of our state, that we should know well how to distinguish what is nature from what is grace. And an appendix to this work, taken from Thomas à Kempis, begins : “ Son, thou must diligently apprehend the motions of nature and grace, for they move themselves contrary, and scarce are they distinguished unless by a spiritual and inwardly enlightened man.” In fact, without these antitheses there is no Christian life, and without the distinction of these antitheses there is no Christian self-knowledge. Nature and grace are as rootedly, as essentially antithetical as world and God. But it is a fundamental characteristic of the new theology that it so softens down the sharpness of these antitheses as to make the distinction vanish. Whether it admits the fact or not, the case actually stands thus : it alters the essence of grace, and makes everything nature. This is the deep gulf which parts the old from the new theology, and makes intercourse impossible.

The Christian, as such, leads, as Paul depicts in the seventh and eighth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, a dual life, in which he feels himself on the one side in servitude and misery, on the other free and blessed. The

carnal life, in which is rooted his natural existence, still continues, and never ceases to throw evil shadows on his spiritual life; while this spiritual life is a planting of grace, which has removed him from the law of nature, and set him in a sphere of life exalted above it, and is thus a working of God *supra naturam* because *contra naturam*. For, as the apostle says in chap. viii. 2, "The law of the Spirit, which quickens us in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death." "I live," he can say in Galatians ii. 20; "yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." The division between nature and grace reaches thus to the centre of his being. His natural I is enthralled under the curse of the law; but Christ is his righteousness, in Him he has obtained a new I, which knows itself as free from the law and just before God. No one has more profoundly grasped this truth, or more powerfully attested it, than Luther in his memorable exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians. There is, he there affirms, a righteousness which belongs to the earthly, and a righteousness which belongs to the heavenly world; a righteousness of the law, which is an affair of earth and of our own action, and a righteousness which we, without our action, must receive from heaven, the righteousness of Christ, which is ours when we become by faith so united to Him, that He takes upon Himself everything condemnable that attaches to us, and in place thereof gives us Himself with His righteousness, His victory, and His life as our own. Thus grace works into the natural life of man a new supernatural life, which differs from the former as essentially as the future world of glory from the present world of birth and decay.

III.

Or are those extravagances which lift Christian experience beyond the realm of actuality into that of the

imaginary? The new theology must pronounce such a judgment. We however rule it to be incompetent, seeing that it starts from preconceptions which render it incapable of experiences such as those of a Paul or a Luther. A theologian who denies that sinfulness is the inheritance of man from his birth, that man by nature is a child of wrath, and has to confess himself a sinner worthy of condemnation; who denies that Christ by substitutionary work and suffering has satisfied the righteousness or the wrath of God, and made for the love of God an open path; who denies that we can enter into a direct real relation of communion with God and the risen Christ,—such a theologian has by these preconceptions rendered himself from the outset unable to experience and personally to test the work of grace in his soul.

But these assertions—it will be objected—are in truth no preconceptions. On the contrary, they are conclusions based on observation of our religious life and experience. So then experience stands opposed to experience. In our opinion, that is only a very superficial introspection which fails to see that our inborn nature is one sundered from God and penetrated to its most secret folds with defects and sinful impulses; so that we must accuse ourselves before a holy God as having earned His punishment in time and eternity, and praise with thankfulness that decree of Divine love, which appointed Christ to work out for us by His crucifixion and ascension the forgiveness of sins and a new beginning of life, and which thus made it possible for sinners worthy of condemnation to become by faith the beloved of God. With regard to the real personal intercourse with the living God and the revealed Son of God and man, the new dogmatic school views this as a mystic illusion opposed to experience; while in its place it puts a mediate relationship effected through the Christian community, and through what God in Christ has become to this community. This

is in opposition to the promise of the Lord, "He who loveth Me will keep My word, and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and dwell with him" (John xiv. 23); in opposition to the testimony of believers of the new covenant since the time of the apostles; in opposition also to psalmists and prophets. It is not in agreement with historical Christianity to refer redemption and salvation directly to the community and only indirectly to the individual. The relations are ever found to be reversed. It is individuals who, with a sense of merited condemnation, desire to be made whole, and who grasp with faith the offered grace of God in Christ, that form the community of the saved—the unseen beginning of a kingdom of God, of a commonwealth, that is, heavenly in origin and nature, whose essence is living communion with God in Christ, and which starts from this centre in its work of subduing the world and moulding earth after the likeness of heaven.

There is no biblical conception which, as treated by this new theology, does not lose in depth and in fulness of contents. True, the kingdom of God is explained to be supernatural and supramundane: but only supernatural in so far as it surpasses the natural forms of society (marriage, social and national relationship); and only supramundane in so far as it has for its bond of union the working of the invisible motive love. So far correct: but the supernatural and the supramundane character of the kingdom of God consists above all in this, that its foundation in the human soul is a work of supernatural and supramundane influence; a work of God according to the overflowing riches of His grace in Christ Jesus, as the Lord Himself said, "The kingdom of God is within you"; and as His apostle said, "The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

He who, in the midst of his estrangement from God and degradation in sin, has experienced this spiritual trans-

formation knows that he owes it to the supernatural interference of the rescuing hand of God, and feels himself placed in a new world, in contrast with which his earlier existence appears like the groping of a blind man or the lethargy of one more dead than alive. This new birth, which is accomplished within the realm of Divine grace by way of repentance and faith, together with the workings of grace by which it is brought to pass and maintained, does not in the new theology receive its due. Even as the closest living union with God and the risen Saviour is rejected as mystical, this process of conversion is considered pietistic. Though I differed on many points with the late Ferdinand Walther, together with whom I passed through the throes and raptures of the new spiritual birth, on one point we remained ever agreed—that the condition of the true Christian is a supernatural one, seeing that it has its root in the new birth which he has experienced. This condition is wanting in the new theology. Apart from its rejection of the so-called metaphysical element, to which it denies any practical significance, the new school speaks with regard to the actual facts of experience a language of moral shallowness foreign to the Christian and the theologian of the old stock. The difference between nature and grace is here toned down and washed out, and that makes the deep gulf which divides us.

IV.

That the Christianity of the new theology is not that recorded in history is further evident from this, that in identifying grace with nature, it at the same time denies the reality of miracles. For miracle has grace as its ground, purpose, and province. The supernatural influences of God on man, which produce in him the new spiritual life, issue from the decree of grace which aims at man's salvation; and the supernatural interference of God

in external events only subserves the realization of this decree. Between those redemptive operations of grace and these historical miracles lie the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, especially the gift of prophecy, which lifts the receiver above the restrictions of nature. In every such gift is manifest the free activity of God, which breaks through the natural chain of causation to fulfil moral purposes connected with the decree of His saving grace. The new theology however recognises no interruption of the course of natural law, under a Divine direction independent of nature. It reduces the miracle to nature; more specially to a natural phenomenon, with which, according to the usual definition, there is connected the experience of a particularly helpful providence. This is not a different gulf from that already mentioned; but how deep the gulf is, we now rightly apprehend for the first time!

For here it is plain, that the difference between old and new theology coincides at bottom with the difference between the two conceptions of the world, which are at present more harshly opposed than ever before. The modern view of the world declares the miracle to be unthinkable, and thus excluded from the historical mode of treatment; for there is only the one world-system, that of natural law, with whose permanence the direct, extraordinary interferences of God are irreconcilable. The opposite view, on the other hand, does not content itself with regarding the miracle as possible; it regards this as absolutely necessary, for it distinguishes two world-systems, that of natural law and that of morals, both of which, since there are men and so history, act and react on one another; inasmuch as the relation of God to free beings brings this in its train, that interferences take place in the course of nature which make it subserve moral ends. This is the Christian, the biblical, and, as we may venture to assert; the religious conception of the world, for it is the presup-

position of all historical religions : whereas the other view is a doctrine of philosophy and natural science, which would fain be recognised as a practical religion, but which never will, inasmuch as it surrenders inalienable ground-principles of religion in denying living intercourse with the Godhead, and, in order to hold intact the inviolability of the chain of causation found in natural law, is compelled to abandon the freedom both of man and of God.

The restricting of God to the course of nature has for its result that we must deny to all prayer, alike of entreaty and intercession, any effect on external events mediated by response to prayer. Heinrich Lang, in a work with the title, *Religion in the Time of Darwin* (1874), handles this subject in a way to make one shudder, when he quotes Psalm xci., and then says, that the comfort of this psalm is due to a way of thinking which has been discredited ; that no prayer or blessing which accompanies the son on his way to battle can avail to check or turn aside the fatal ball. As if there were not accredited answers to prayer, like the intercession of Luther for Melanchthon and Myconius ! And as if each faithful petitioner could not, from his own experience, substantiate the psalmist's words (lxvi. 3), "Thou hearest prayer, therefore cometh all flesh to Thee" ! All flesh—for everywhere in the world of men where prayer is offered, this is done in the certainty that prayer has effect on God and can call forth active help in return. There is more reason in the *consensus gentium* than in the doctrines of isolated thinkers, even be they so great as Schleiermacher and Ritschl. We can refute the testimony of the soul on paper, but it is impossible permanently to suppress its reaction in our inmost nature.

V.

But not alone do the life of prayer and, in general, the religious life receive from this restricting of God to the

course of nature a character different from that hitherto found among men. Even faith in the Easter message begins to waver. Our greeting on Easter Day loses heart. The "He is risen!" which rings through the New Testament like the blast of the trumpet of victory, becomes less probable than the allegation of the Jews, "His disciples stole Him." For if God cannot make the course of nature subservient to higher ends, and, as a creator, in special circumstances interfere with the created order of nature, then is the re-awakening of Christ no historical fact; His work lacks the Divine seal; and Paul himself says, in 1 Corinthians xv. 4, that if the resurrection falls, Christianity ceases to exist as a religion of redemption, and can no more deliver the human consciousness and life from the ban of sin and death. The disciples of the new theology recognise the resurrection as a fact in the consciousness of the early Church, but towards it as a fact of history they remain cold and reserved. In their system, this is not the centre, but merely a dim point in the periphery. Logical consistency on their part would cause it to vanish altogether.

With melancholy frankness did Alexander Schweizer, who died on the third of July last, put this question in a kindly notice of my *Apologetics* which appeared in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung* for 1862: "Are we then, by assuming this one event, to abandon the entire modern view of the world?" And Heinrich Lang in the *Zeitstimmen* for 1861, confesed honourably: "So soon as I can convince myself of the reality of the resurrection of Christ, this absolute miracle, as Paul seems to declare it, I shatter the modern conception of the world. This breach in the order of nature, which I regard as inviolable, would be an irreparable breach in my system, in my whole world of thought." In fact, he who in principle rejects the miracle must also reject the historical nature of the resurrection of Christ; but he who acknowledges as history this one

miracle will also find it not improbable that this is the conclusion of miraculous premisses and brings miraculous results in its train. The decree of grace which attains in the resurrection of Christ the centre and summit of its realization fulfils itself in miracles. In most cases, indeed, is the government of God like the waters of Siloah, that go softly ; the visible miracles of history are only those flashes from the supernatural activity of God which serve rare and exceptional ends. But the whole work of grace, whether in the experience of individuals or in the history of mankind, even where it is hidden, is supernatural and therefore miraculous ; because, in the midst of this world lying under the law of sin and death, it aims at establishing a world of righteousness and glory.

VI.

When the one conception of the world is thus presented from the standpoint of the other, the mode of statement unavoidably partakes of the nature of a polemic. The special purpose however with which I entered on my subject was not polemical. I wished to exhibit as objectively as possible the deep gap which divides the theologians of to-day, especially the thoughtful minds who have come into contact with philosophy and natural science, into two camps. An accommodation of this antagonism is impossible. We must belong to the one camp or the other. We may, it is true, inside the negative camp, tone down our negation to the very border of affirmation, and, inside the positive camp, we may weaken our affirmation so as almost to change it to negation : the representation by individuals of the one standpoint or the other leaves room for a multitude of gradations and shades. But to the fundamental question. Is there a supernatural realm of grace, and within it a miraculous interference of God in the world of nature, an interference displaying itself most centrally and decisively

in the raising of the Redeemer from the dead?—to this fundamental question, however we may seek to evade it, the answer can only be yes or no. The deep gulf remains; it will remain to the end of time. No effort of thought can fill it up. There is no synthesis to bridge this thesis and antithesis. Never shall we be able, by means of reason's evidence or the witness of history, to convince those who reject this truth. But this do we claim for ourselves, that prophets and apostles and the Lord Himself stand upon our side; this we claim, that while the others use the treasures of God's word eclectically, we take our stand upon the whole, undivided truth.

True, there is a zone to a certain extent neutral, that, namely, of historico-critical and particularly of literary-critical investigation; but here also the distinction of standpoint manifests itself in estimating tradition, weighing evidences, and measuring degrees of certainty. And it is a most disheartening sign of the times, that even such as in theory acknowledge the miracle, in practice really reckon on naturalistic assumptions. The *theologia gloriæ*, which prides itself on being its own highest authority, bewitches even those who appeared proof against its enchantments; and the *theologia crucis*, which holds Divine folly to be wiser than men, is regarded as an unscientific lagging behind the steps of progress. But the subjectivity of science finds a wholesome check in the office of preacher and guardian of souls. Only those of little faith can fancy that such science as this, which, with its fruitless knowledge and washed out *credo*, must be dumb beside the bed of death, menaces the existence of the Church. In the Muldenthal I was, as a young man, a witness of soul-struggles and spiritual victories, which rendered distasteful to me for ever the over-estimation of science. Still does my spiritual life find its root in the miraculous soil of that first love which I experienced with Lehmann, Zöpffel, Ferdinand Walther,

and Bürger; still to me is the reality of miracles sealed by the miracles of grace which I saw with my own eyes in the congregations of this blessed valley. And the faith which I professed in my first sermons, which I could maintain in Niederfrohna and Lunzenau, remains mine to-day, undiminished in strength, and immeasurably higher than all earthly knowledge. Even if in many biblical questions I have to oppose the traditional opinion, certainly my opposition remains on this side of the gulf, on the side of the theology of the Cross, of grace, of miracles, in harmony with the good confession of our Lutheran Church. By this banner let us stand; folding ourselves in it, let us die.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

PROFESSOR CHEYNE.

THE writer of this brief article must at the outset distinctly disclaim all title to criticise Dr. Cheyne's books, and he has not sought to inform himself of any facts in his life that are not matter of common knowledge. His object is simply to illustrate the nature of Professor Cheyne's work for sound biblical study in this generation by a sketch of the attitude which the Church of England, as represented by her authorized teachers, has assumed towards the question of inspiration and the criticism of the Old Testament. The statement is intended to be purely historical.

The importance and significance of German criticism was first clearly recognised in the Church of England by Hugh James Rose, whom Dean Burgon has described as "the Restorer of the Old Path." Rose, after spending some time in Germany, in 1824, returned home alarmed and shocked. In May, 1825, he was select preacher at Cambridge, and

delivered discourses on the state of the Protestant Religion in Germany, which were heard and read with interest and concern. Strangely enough, Dr. Pusey replied on behalf of Germany. The matter is so important, and it has been so slurred over and misrepresented by Dean Burgon in his *Lives of Twelve Good Men*,¹ that it must be treated with some fulness.

Dr. Pusey's *Historical Inquiry into the probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately Predominant in the Theology of Germany* appeared before his appointment to the professorship of Hebrew in Oxford. The drift of the book is that rationalism is due to the absurdly excessive claims of orthodoxy. To quote: "False ideas of inspiration, introduced by the imaginary necessities of the argument with the Romanists, contributed to the same result. From the first assumption, that the whole of Scripture was immediately dictated by the Holy Spirit, was derived a second, that all must be of equal value; to prove this it was supposed that the same doctrines, the same fundamental truths in Christianity, must be not implied but expressed by all, a theory which must of necessity do much violence to the sacred text, while it overlooked the beautiful arrangement, according to which the different doctrines of revelation are each prominently conveyed by that mind which was most adapted to its reception (love by St. John; faith by St. Paul; hope by St. Peter; faith developed in works by St. James), and thus the highest illuminations of inspired minds, each in the fullest degree of which it was capable, are combined to convey to us the vast complex of Scripture truth. Yet greater

¹ Vol. i., p. 134.—Experience has shown the writer that in reading Dean Burgon's biographies it is especially necessary to "verify your references." After the testimonies borne to Dean Burgon by those who knew him, it is impossible to doubt his good faith; nevertheless his statements are to be received with the utmost caution. The fact that the history of the Oxford movement has been as yet written only by men who were more or less partisans, makes it imperative for those who wish to understand it to go back to the pamphlets and magazines of the time.

confusion must obviously be the result of the same theory when applied to the Old Testament. The difference of the Law and the Gospel, which hitherto had been so vividly seen, was obstructed, the shadow identified with the substance, the preparatory system with the perfect disclosure. Not content with finding the germs of Christian doctrine in the Old Testament, or those dawning rays which were to prepare the mental eye for the gradual reception of fuller light, but whose entire character could only be understood by those whose approach they announced, they not only considered prophecy as being throughout inverted history, but held that all the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity were even to the Jews as much revealed in the Old Testament as in the New, and that the knowledge of the doctrines was as necessary to their salvation as to ours. . . . Less important, lastly, though perhaps in its effects more immediately dangerous, was the corollary to the same theory of inspiration, that even historical passages were equally inspired with the rest, and consequently that no error, however minute, could even here be admitted. Yet the imparting of religious truth being the object of revelation, any further extension of inspiration would appear as an unnecessary miracle, as indeed it is one nowhere claimed by the readers of the New Testament." Pusey goes on to say that this "palpable perversion of the doctrine of inspiration" prepared the way for the indiscriminate rejection of the doctrine itself, and that Scripture as a result of it was not expounded even in the divinity schools.

Rose replied in 1829. His answer took the form of a letter to the Bishop of London. It is more effectively written than Pusey's book, but shows much keenness of feeling, and in parts obviously misrepresents Pusey. For one thing, he does not squarely meet Pusey's position on inspiration, but rides off with an impassioned affirmation of the inspiration of the gospels. More effective is the

charge against Pusey of having borrowed the substance of his book from Tholuck's lectures.¹

Dr. Pusey was now Regius Professor of Hebrew, and took time over his reply, which appeared in 1830. He writes with much calmness of manner; and while admitting crudities, stands by his main position. He had previously replied very coolly to the charge of plagiarism from Tholuck by pointing out that large passages of the book were not from Tholuck; that Tholuck had given him permission to use his lectures, but not to publish his name; and that he had made an acknowledgment sufficient to cover his debt. But he adheres strongly to his rejection of a doctrine of inspiration condemned by Secker, Lowth, Tillotson, Van Mildert, and Blomfield, but affirmed by the eminent Scotch theologian, Dr. Dick, in these terms: "A contradiction which was fairly chargeable to the sacred writers themselves would completely disprove their inspiration." Against this Pusey says that the question of credibility must be settled before that of inspiration can be discussed, and that the old theory had shown a tendency to produce among laymen one precisely opposite, one which falls as far below as the former far exceeded what may be collected from Scripture.²

Whether Dr. Pusey anywhere repudiates the chief doctrines of his early volumes I cannot tell. But his

¹ Mr. de Soyres, in an able article on Tholuck, recently published in the *Guardian*, hardly does justice to Pusey on this point.

² Dean Burgon, in his *Life of Rose* (p. 134) has the following very loose sentence: "Pusey's religious views underwent a very serious change about the same time; and shortly after his two learned and interesting volumes were by himself withdrawn from circulation." I do not know what evidence there is of a change of religious views on the part of Pusey; but that there was no change in his attitude to biblical criticism is clearly shown from the preface to his book on Daniel, where he declares that forty years before he had satisfied himself of the authenticity of the Pentateuch, which he indeed formerly accepted on the authority of our Lord. He admits that his early books were crude, but speaks of them as withdrawn thirty years before—much later than Dean Burgon suggests.

labours as a professor were simply to establish the Jewish and early Christian tradition in biblical criticism. His activities in various directions were incessant, but not "of a nature to enhance the reputation of a Hebrew professor." The controversies about the Bible died down. Those who had been troubled by them were reassured by translations from Hengstenberg, Keil, and other German writers of approved orthodoxy. Very little genuine study of the Old Testament was carried on in the Church of England. The atmosphere was however disturbed by the appearance of *Essays and Reviews*, of Bishop Colenso, and, may I add? of the *Academy*.

Essays and Reviews is now forgotten, but it did something, and a chapter on its history need not be uninteresting. It raised the whole question of inspiration and the Old Testament, not perhaps wisely, but distinctly. Dr. Rowland Williams, the brilliant and fiery Welshman, who wrote one of the most obnoxious essays, was not a sound philologist, and his books are almost obsolete. But his whereabouts is shown in that very remarkable and little-known volume, *Defence of the Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D.*, by James Fitzjames Stephen, of the Inner Temple,¹ one of the ablest treatises on inspiration in the English language. The eloquent advocate says, referring to the enemies of biblical criticism, "If they could catch but one glimpse of the nature of the book they so ignorantly defend, instead of attempting to proscribe science and criticism, they would welcome them as the ministers of God for the good of their souls, as the appointed means of displaying to mankind in their full glory the power of the Bible and of religion to bless mankind here and to save them hereafter." Williams was victorious; the clamour soon declined. The real worth of *Essays and Reviews*, looking back upon it now, is not great; and Diestel's severe criticism in the *Jahrbücher*

¹ Smith, Elder & Co., 1862.

für deutsche Theologie is still the best. But the alarm it produced was increased by the publication of Colenso's books on the Pentateuch, the earlier parts of which obtained a wide circulation. As time passed on this declined; and although Bishop Colenso gradually acquired a mastery of Hebrew and of German criticism, yet in the judgment of such men as Kuenen and Wellhausen, the earlier parts of his work are the most important, as the author brought a fresh arithmetical eye to the early records, and produced his results with sharpness and reality, while he had not the faculties of a great critic even when learning came to him. Colenso was replied to on every hand, and that generally with contumely. It was felt however that hard words were not sufficient, and the *Speaker's Commentary* was arranged for, while Dr. Pusey undertook the defence of the Book of Daniel. This was considered satisfactory: the orthodox school of Germans, including Delitzsch and all the writers accessible to the English public, was with the English conservatives; few young Hebraists of real power were appearing in England; and the offence of heterodoxy seemed to have ceased.

In these circumstances Dr. Cheyne's life-work was begun. He had with prescient eye resolved to devote himself to Hebrew literature, and had received undying impulses from Ewald as well as much instruction from others in Germany. He returned to Oxford, and began immediately to produce original work, which called forth high encomiums from the foremost Germans. His powerful influence on the general public was exerted through the *Academy*, a journal started by Dr. C. E. Appleton, one of the truest benefactors to English literature in our time. Appleton, who had been much in Germany, was impressed with the insularity and poverty of English culture, and set himself, with heroic confidence in a people yet unawakened, to provide an organ of criticism,

planned on the lines of the *Literarisches Centralblatt*. Dr. Cheyne became one of his closest helpers, and organized the theological department into thorough efficiency; securing as contributors, not only such men as Lightfoot and Westcott in this country, but all the leading theological writers on the Continent, including Diestel, Lipsius, and many more. Not a few who began to study theology about twenty years ago will never forget the impulse given them by the *Academy*, and most of all by the fresh, fearless, and brilliant criticisms of Dr. Cheyne himself. I do not wish to "resurrect" articles which the learned author may be inclined to regard as freaks of youthful audacity. But we learned from him that the *Speaker's Commentary* was not a satisfactory reply to Colenso; that Dr. Pusey was hardly level with Keil, while a comparison with Delitzsch was out of the question; that even English heresiarchs were of as little account as the most orthodox. He was the first to expound the Grafian theory of the Pentateuch, which has engaged scholars so much of late years and almost broke up a Scotch Church, stating the case for and against with a clearness never surpassed. Meanwhile he was working at his *Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged* (1871), which led no less a man than Diestel to pronounce him "a master of scientific exegesis."

For years after he pursued a course of unslackening industry, producing along with Dr. Driver an edition of the A.V. with various renderings and readings from the best authorities, one of the best aids existing to biblical exposition. But a revolution was taking place in his ideas. The critical movement had met with a serious check, as it appeared, first, that it involved literary pretensions which could not be allowed to any critics, and especially to critics of an unspiritual and unimaginative type. Matthew Arnold did good service in dwelling on the value of internal evidence on questions of disputed

authorship; and in insisting that on the literary and moral value of the biblical writings Hebrew and Greek learning gave no necessary right to speak. It was obvious further that the deductions drawn from the results of criticism were such usually as to destroy the whole foundation of supernatural religion, as in the case of Bishop Colenso. Passing through a period of deep religious feeling, Dr. Cheyne gave full weight to considerations such as these, and produced (1880-1884) his great book on Isaiah, which is perhaps thus far his highest achievement, and in which he strove to speak "a piercing and reconciling word." This book was warmly welcomed by Franz Delitzsch and others, and was thought by many to signify a much more radical change of critical position than it really did.

After some years of ministry in Tendring, where he was busy in all his spheres, Dr. Cheyne returned to Oxford as Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture; and has published his books on *Job and Solomon* and the Psalms, which have already taken their place among the classics of exegesis. He is for three months of every year in residence at Rochester as one of the canons, and has gained great popularity as a preacher in the cathedral pulpit. He has been able to reconcile with marvellous felicity the two great aims of his life: to advance biblical knowledge, and to teach it to his countrymen as they are able to bear it. This very specially appears in his last volume, *The Hallowing of Criticism*, which contains some fresh and bright cathedral sermons on Elijah, and a paper read at the Church Congress which these illustrate.

I have been obliged to omit many names, such as those of Dean Stanley, Dean Perowne, the Nestor of English Hebraists, Dr. Quarry, and others, which would have been placed in this sketch had more space been attainable. The prejudice against biblical criticism has practically disappeared in the Church of England, as is shown by the recent

remarkable discussion at the Church Congress, notably the speech of the Bishop of Manchester. Men like Dr. Driver, Dr. Cheyne, Dean Perowne are at one in their view of criticism with New Testament scholars like Bishop Lightfoot, Canon Westcott, Archdeacon Farrar, and Dr. Sanday. All are profound believers in supernatural Christianity. Perhaps it is not too much to say, that largely through Dr. Cheyne's influence scholars are now working at the Old Testament in firm confidence of bringing out results at once reconcilable with the attitude of Jesus to the Old Covenant, with the faith of the Church in Divine revelation, and with the surest conclusions of scholarship and science.

EDITOR.

EPAPHRODITUS AND THE GIFT FROM PHILIPPI.

IN this paper I shall endeavour, by expounding a few verses of the Epistle to the Philippians, to reproduce a most interesting and instructive episode in the Church life of the first century, and to pay a deserved tribute of honour to a little-known but very admirable contemporary and friend of the Apostle Paul.

The letter bears marks of the prison in which it was written (Phil. i. 7, 13). That St. Paul refers twice to his *bonds*, that he does not tell his readers that he is in prison, but assumes that they know it and speaks only of the results of his imprisonment, suggests that it was no passing incident, but had lasted for some time. That in vers. 20-26 he lingers over the alternative of *life* or *death*, suggests that his life then hung in the balance. Ver. 26 reveals a good hope of release. And chapter ii. 23, *So soon as I shall see how it will go with me*, suggests that a crisis was at hand.

The implied length of the imprisonment compels us to suppose that the letter was written not later than St. Paul's arrest at Jerusalem. For we have no hint of any long imprisonment earlier than that event. The probable reference in chapter i. 13 to *the Prætorian Guard*, and the mention in chapter iv. 22 of *Cæsar's household*, support strongly the universal tradition that the Epistle was written from Rome.

We shall find that not only had news of St. Paul's imprisonment reached Philippi, but that after some delay a contribution for him had been made and sent to Rome; that the messenger had been seriously ill; that the Philippian Christians had heard this; and that he knew that they had heard it, and was therefore anxious to return. All this implies a lapse of at least several months between

the Apostle's arrival at Rome and the writing of this Epistle.

That the Epistle was an acknowledgment of a gift sent from Philippi to St. Paul at Rome by the hand of Epaphroditus is placed beyond doubt by chapter iv. 10, 14; and especially by ver. 18, *Having received from Epaphroditus the things from you*. News of the Apostle's arrival as a prisoner at Rome would easily and quickly reach Philippi. For between Rome and this Roman colony there was good communication along the Appian Way and Trajan's Way to Brundisium, across the narrow straits, and then along the Egnatian Way; and travellers on this familiar route were many. The words *now at length* in chapter iv. 10 imply delay. But the delay was by no means the fault of the Philippian Christians: *Ye did take thought, but ye lacked opportunity*. The lack of opportunity reminds us of the difficulty of sending money in ancient days. From St. Paul's words we learn that the news of his imprisonment and want at once filled the Christians at Philippi with solicitude on his behalf, and with an eager desire to help, but that difficulty of communication prevented for a time this desire from taking practical form. This mental activity on his behalf is accurately described by the Greek word *φρονεῖν*, a favourite with the Apostle, and in the New Testament with him only, and a note of the genuineness of this Epistle. (See Rom. viii. 5; xi. 20; xii. 3 twice, 16 twice; xiv. 6 twice; xv. 5, etc.)

At length an opportunity of sending help occurs. A good Christian man, whose name we never meet except in this Epistle, is going to Rome. Whether he undertook this journey simply in order to carry the gift his brethren had long and vainly wished to send, or whether other business led him to the metropolis, we have no means of knowing. In any case, Epaphroditus is going to Rome. And the Christians at Philippi resolve to send by him help for the

great teacher to whom they owed so much. From chapter iv. 18 we infer that the gift was large: *I have all things, and abound: I am filled, having received from Epaphroditus the things from you.* Certainly it was as large as St. Paul needed. If, as is probable, the Christians at Philippi were as poor as the others in the province of Macedonia, and if these were as poor at this time as, in 2 Corinthians viii. 2, St. Paul says they were a few years earlier, their *deep poverty* would immensely increase the significance and worth of this abundant gift. We may suppose that the contribution was quickly made, and that Epaphroditus was soon on his way with it to the prisoner at Rome.

The gift filled St. Paul with joy: *I rejoiced greatly,* (Phil. iv. 10). And his joy was *in the Lord*; i.e. it was no ordinary human gladness, such as that caused by supply of bodily need, but a joy which had direct relation to the Master whom he served, the Master's personality being, as it were, the surrounding element of the servant's joy. The money sent from Philippi revealed the genuineness and strength of the Christian life of St. Paul's converts there, the power of Christ to change the hearts of men, and the truth of the Gospel which St. Paul preached. It thus gave to him a firmer confidence and richer joy in Christ.

Similarly, as he tells us in chapter i. 14, St. Paul's imprisonment gave to the more part of the Christians at Rome a fuller confidence in Christ; they were *trusting in the Lord through my bonds.* For so close is the relation between Christ and His servants, that whatever they do or suffer in obedience to Him reveals to themselves and to others His presence and glory.

It has often been noticed that among all the Epistles of St. Paul that to the Philippians is pre-eminently marked by joy. Although written in the gloom of a dungeon, and under shadow of the gallows, it is at many points irradiated by a brightness Divine. So chapter i. 4, 18, 25;

ii. 2, 17, 18, 28, 29 ; iii. 1 ; iv. 1, 4 twice, 10. And we can well conceive that this vein of gladness was prompted chiefly by the evidence afforded in the money brought by Epaphroditus of the spiritual power of the Gospel, and of the success of St. Paul's work. So rich a harvest from seed sown in tears might well fill the sower's heart with joy. We wonder not that in chapter iv. 1 he speaks of these loving children in the faith as his *joy and crown*, and that his letter to them overflows with joy on their behalf.

Inasmuch as the gift from Philippi was a natural out-working of the Christian life operating according to its own organic laws, the Apostle describes it in a metaphor taken from vegetable growth : *Ye have revived, or caused to sprout, your thought on my behalf*. For a time want of opportunity prevented this manifestation of the Christian life. But the life was there. And when the hindrance was removed, like the torpor of winter retiring at the approach of spring, the old stock burst forth into new foliage and fruit. Another form of the same metaphor meets us in ver. 17 : *I seek for the fruit which increaseth to your account*.

By making this contribution, the Christians at Philippi, as we read in ver. 14, *had fellowship with* St. Paul's *affliction*. For by submitting to the self-denial involved in their gift to him they placed themselves to this extent under the burden of imprisonment and want which was pressing upon him, and thus helped him to bear it.

Their gift is called in ver. 18 *an acceptable sacrifice, well-pleasing to God*. For Christ had already said, as recorded in Matthew xxv. 40, *Inasmuch as ye did it to one of these My brethren, ye did it to Me*. And whatever is done for Christ is an offering laid upon the altar of God. The phrase, *odour of sweet smell*, recalls at once the same words as a sort of refrain at the close of the prescription for each of three kinds of sacrifice in Leviticus i. 9, 13, 17, and elsewhere. And certainly the gracefulness of the gift from

Philippi, pleasant to God and to man, was a perfume more fragrant than all the Levitical ritual.

The Apostle reminds his readers that the gift for which he now thanks them was not their first gift to him. Long ago, *at the beginning of the Gospel*, when St. Paul first preached at Philippi and Thessalonica and then *went forth from Macedonia* to Athens and Corinth, the Philippian Christians sent a contribution for his support while preaching the Gospel in another province. This is a most interesting coincidence with 2 Corinthians xi. 9, *When I was present with you, and was in want, . . . the brethren, when they came from Macedonia, supplied the measure of my want.* From the Epistle before us we learn that this Macedonian liberality was entirely from Philippi: *No Church except ye only.* Even this was not their first gift. St. Paul reminds them that before he left Macedonia they sent a gift to him *at Thessalonica*. More even than this. During his short stay there they sent *twice* to supply his need.

The above casual and evidently undesigned coincidences between this Epistle and the second Epistle to the Corinthians and the Book of Acts strongly confirm our other abundant proof of the genuineness of these Epistles and of the historic truthfulness of the Book of Acts.

Once more. In 2 Corinthians viii. 1, 2, St. Paul speaks in glowing terms about the liberality of the Macedonian Christians in the great contribution he was then organizing among the Gentiles for the poor of the Christians at Jerusalem, holding them up as an example to the Christians at Corinth. We have here no mention of Philippi. But the earlier and later gifts of the Christians there suggest irresistibly that also in this contribution they took a leading part. If so, we have five distinct gifts from Philippi: two to St. Paul at Thessalonica, one to him at Corinth, one for the Christians at Jerusalem, and one for St. Paul at Rome.

These incidents taken together are full of significance, and present to us a most beautiful and instructive picture of early Christian generosity. The Christians at Philippi did a good work, which no one around them had done before. They made a contribution to enable one who had taught them to teach others at a distance from themselves. And by so doing they gained the high honour of opening up a new path of Christian well-doing. Moreover their liberality was no passing emotion. Long years afterwards, and when St. Paul was so far away that they could not render him practical aid, they were eager to do so; and did so at the first opportunity. Their thoughtful care for the Apostle not only sprang up and bore fruit at once, but its fruitfulness continued undiminished after the lapse of many years. Once more. The generosity of the Philippian Christians was not limited to kindness towards St. Paul. They who so readily contributed to supply the needs of the great Apostle, to whom they owed so much, contributed also to supply the needs of men to whom they owed nothing whatever, whom they had never seen, and whose attitude towards themselves had been rather hostile than friendly. For their liberality was prompted, not by human gratitude, but by love to Christ and to those for whom Christ had died.

It has often been noticed that among the Churches addressed by St. Paul, the Christians at Philippi occupy the highest place. Except a passing reference to a misunderstanding between two persons whom otherwise he commends, his letter to the Philippians contains no word of reproof and not many words of warning—a conspicuous contrast to most of his letters to Churches. He tells them, in chapter i. 3-5, that his every prayer for them is made with joy; the reason of his joy being their spirit of brotherhood for the spread of the Gospel, a brotherliness which began with the beginning of their Christian life and con-

tinues to the present hour. We notice here on a wider scale the early development and the constancy already noticed in the one detail of generosity. The coincidence is not accidental. Gold perishes. But gold represents material good. Consequently a man's dealings with money reveal his conception of material good, and thus reveal his inmost character. The gifts of the Christians at Philippi were prompted by genuine and intelligent love, the central virtue of the Christian life. And the love which prompted them bore fruit also in all other directions; or, rather, it wrought in them a rich and full development of Christian excellence. Thus the spiritual pre-eminence of the Church at Philippi reveals the sacredness of Christian giving. This does not imply any unfair advantage to the rich. For the spiritual worth of giving is in inverse proportion to the wealth of the giver. The liberal givers in this case were probably poor. But it points out to the rich, and to all men, a pathway they must tread if they are to climb the heights of real Christian excellence.

The spiritual importance of generosity St. Paul knew well. Hence his joy at the gift from Philippi. For he tells us in chapter iv. 17 that in his joy he is thinking, not about the supply of his own temporal need, but of the harvest of spiritual blessing which the gift is working out for the givers.

We now return to Epaphroditus, the bearer of the gift from Philippi. St. Paul speaks of him in chapter ii. 25 as *your apostle*. This designation sheds light upon the title given by Christ, as recorded in Luke vi. 13, to the highest rank (1 Cor. xii. 28) of His servants. Just as they were commissioned by Him to bear to all men everywhere the good news of life, so Epaphroditus was commissioned by the Christians at Philippi to carry their gift to St. Paul. A similar use of the same word is found in 2 Corinthians viii. 23: *apostles of Churches*.

Another title of honour is given to Epaphroditus. St. Paul calls him *your minister of my need*. The Greek word here used, *λειτουργός*, and a cognate word with the same reference in ver. 30, are different from, and stronger than, the word commonly in the New Testament translated *minister*; and denote a public officer, or some one who renders service to the State. The same word is regularly used in the Septuagint, e.g. Exodus xxviii. 35, 43, etc., as the title of the priests, the public and official servants of God in the ritual of the Old Covenant. A similar, but proportionately greater, honour St. Paul claims for himself in Romans xv. 16, where, using the same word, he calls himself *a public-minister of Jesus Christ*; and explains this title by saying that to proclaim *the Gospel of God* is his public and sacred and priestly work, and that *the offering* he desires to present to God is nothing less than the Gentiles consecrated to His service.

A similar title of honour St. Paul now gives to Epaphroditus. By so doing he reminds his readers, that in bringing their gift to Rome he was performing on their behalf a public and sacred work, *viz.* the supply of St. Paul's need. This work the Christians at Philippi would themselves have performed by personal attention to St. Paul. But this personal help, distance prevented them from rendering. The *lack* (ver. 30) of it Epaphroditus supplied by bringing their money to the imprisoned Apostle. Doubtless this word was chosen in order to emphasise the importance and dignity and sacredness of the work committed to Epaphroditus.

In discharging the duty laid upon him by the Church at Philippi, the messenger fell seriously ill: *He was sick nigh to death; . . . he came near to death, hazarding his life in order to make up for the absence of your ministry towards me.* The details of this illness are unknown to us. Possibly, in his haste to reach and relieve the prisoner, Epa-

phroditus exposed himself to inclement weather on the journey. Or perhaps, in his attention to St. Paul at Rome, he exposed himself to infection. In any case the risk was knowingly encountered, with the express purpose of rendering to the Apostle the service which distance prevented the Christians at Philippi from rendering. Well might St. Paul speak in ver. 30 of such risk as encountered *because of the work of Christ*. For that which is done and suffered to aid the workers is done for the Master.

The news of the illness of Epaphroditus had reached Philippi: and he knew this. An ordinary man would have been glad that they who sent him knew at how great risk and cost he had discharged their mission. But Epaphroditus was filled with sorrow. This sorrow reveals an exceedingly noble character. It was a mark of genuine unselfishness. He who has risked his life to help the great Apostle is troubled that his sickness has caused trouble to others. He would have preferred to suffer alone. And, since his friends at home are already troubled on his account, his care for them makes him wishful, now that apparently he is again well, to return and by his own presence to dispel their fears on his behalf. This wish to return was prompted by a sentiment so noble, that St. Paul felt that he had no choice but to comply: *Necessary I deemed it to send Epaphroditus*.

The recovery of the sick man, St. Paul attributes, in ver. 27, to the *mercy* of God towards the sufferer and towards himself. This reveals his faith that even the uncertainties of human life are under the control of God. So does his request in 2 Thessalonians iii. 1, 2 for his readers' prayer that he may be preserved from bodily danger. We cannot infer from the above that St. Paul knew of the illness while Epaphroditus was in danger, and prayed for his recovery; although this is quite possible, and not unlikely. For in any case, whether or not the danger

was known to the Apostle, the recovery of the sick man was an act of Divine mercy both to him and to St. Paul.

That Epaphroditus is called a *fellow-worker*, we can easily understand; for St. Paul was essentially a worker, and all his companions shared his toil. But the precise reference of *fellow-soldier* is not quite clear. The same title is in Philemon 2 given to Archippus. Doubtless Epaphroditus would bravely stand beside the prisoner at Rome, and encounter cheerfully whatever risk or hardship this involved. Therefore, naturally, in the conflict of the Christian life, the Apostle calls him a companion in arms.

Notice that St. Paul recognises, and bids his readers recognise, the work done and spirit shown by this brave fellow-soldier: *Hold such in honour*. That honour will be paid while the world lasts.

Put together now the whole story of the gift from Philippi and the journey of Epaphroditus, and we have an incident of surpassing beauty from the life of the early Church. At Philippi we find corporate church life of the highest excellence; and in Epaphroditus we have a private member worthy of the noble Church he represented.

We go in thought, perhaps about the close of the year in which St. Paul arrived a prisoner at Rome, to Philippi. Less than eleven years ago three Jewish strangers visited this Roman colony. They remained a few weeks, until the scourging and imprisonment of two of them made their departure expedient. But the seed sown during that short sojourn had taken deep root. Loving and liberal hearts followed the strangers to other cities of Macedonia, and even beyond the limits of that province. Some six years later St. Paul again visited Philippi, and was overjoyed at the eagerness there manifested to support his great project of a contribution for the poor among the Christians at Jerusalem. The next year, as we learn from Acts xx. 6, on his way to Jerusalem with the completed collection,

St. Paul spent Easter in the bosom of the same beloved Church. Doubtless there, as at Miletus,¹ he spoke of the fears with which he looked forward to his arrival in the city which had now become the citadel of his foes. His subsequent arrest at Jerusalem must have come to the ears of his friends at Philippi. And lately they have heard that he is a prisoner at Rome and in want.

The Church is eager to send help. But no one is able to go to Rome. And none but a personal messenger can carry money safely.

Thus passed, in vain solicitude, some months. At last a messenger is found. Epaphroditus is going, or is able and willing to go, to Rome, and offers to carry help to the prisoner. A large gift is soon collected; and amid the blessings of the Church, and doubtless with many greetings for the Apostle, Epaphroditus starts along the great Roman road towards Rome; but either before or after his arrival there, and in consequence of his loyalty to his trust, the messenger is overtaken by serious illness, and his life is in danger. But his charge is performed. The contribution is duly given to the prisoner.

This unexpected mark of Christian sympathy fills the Apostle with joy. He longs to thank his benefactors. Moreover Epaphroditus is now well, and is troubled to hear that tidings of his illness have reached his friends at Philippi. How great will be their loving anxiety on his behalf, he knows well. He is therefore eager to dispel their fears by his personal presence among them again. This desire St. Paul approves. The opportunity thus afforded, he also resolves to use by sending to his friends at Philippi a worthy acknowledgment of their kindness to him. With this reply, a gift infinitely more precious than that which he brought from Philippi, Epaphroditus starts on his homeward journey. The joy caused by his return, and the

¹ Acts xx. 23.

effect of this wonderful letter when first read in the Church at Philippi, are hidden from us. And we may almost say that with this letter the Church itself passes from our view. To-day, in silent meadows quiet cattle browse among the few ruins which mark the site of what was once the flourishing Roman colony of Philippi, the home of the most attractive Church of the apostolic age. But the name and fame and spiritual influence of that Church will never pass. To myriads of men and women in every age and nation, the letter written in a dungeon at Rome and carried along the Egnatian Way by an obscure Christian messenger, has been a light Divine, and a cheerful guide along the most rugged paths in life. As I watch, and myself rejoice in, the brightness of that far-shining light, and glance at those silent ruins, I see fulfilled an ancient prophecy : *The grass withereth, the flower fadeth : but the word of our God shall stand for ever.*

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PATRISTIC TEXTS.—The Cambridge University press has issued for Prof. Rendel Harris and the Johns Hopkins University a very complete and beautiful edition of *The Teaching of the Apostles*. This edition indeed may be said to take rank as the *editio princeps* of this important relic of primitive Christianity ; for not only does it present a carefully edited text, but it gives photographs of the entire MS., so that any one can satisfy himself as to the correctness of the text. These photographs are beautifully executed, and will do something towards inducing curators of MSS. to follow Prof. Harris' advice, and insure by photography that, if important historical monuments disappear by fire or otherwise, we shall have guaranteed duplicates to refer to. Not only does Prof. Harris give us in this volume an assured text, but the notes he

has appended to this text are of very great value. Indeed among the many excellent editions of the *Teaching* which have been produced, none gives a more truly illustrative book of notes. The chapter on the Hebraisms of the *Teaching* is especially interesting and valuable, adding, as it does, to the information already furnished by Dr. Taylor. The volume does credit to all concerned in its production.

From the same press has been issued *A Collation of the Athos Codex of The Shepherd of Hermas* by Spyr. P. Lambros, Ph.D., Prof. Univ. Athens, translated and edited by J. Armitage Robinson, M.A. Until 1855 the text of the *Shepherd* was merely guessed at through a Latin version. In that year the notorious Constantine Simonides sold to the University of Leipsic what he affirmed was the original Greek text of the *Shepherd*. This was in the form of three leaves of a fourteenth century MS., and a copy of six other leaves of the same MS. which he had not been able to bring away. In consequence of the literary frauds he was found to be perpetrating, the gravest suspicions were thrown upon this pretended copy. But Dr. Lambros, in cataloguing the MSS. of the Athos libraries, came upon one which he believes to be "the much-desired original of the *apographon* of Simonides." It is a collation of this MS. that is now published, and it must of course be the chief authority for the text of *Hermas*.

INTRODUCTION.—To this department of New Testament literature Dr. Paton J. Gloag has made a contribution of great value in his *Introduction to the Catholic Epistles* (T. & T. Clark). In this volume every question which has arisen regarding these epistles is fully and candidly discussed. Nothing escapes Dr. Gloag's research. With the whole field of modern criticism he is familiar; and he puts his reader in possession of an amount of information which very few men have time to acquire for themselves. This research and learning Dr. Gloag uses with great good sense and judgment. His conclusions are at all times reasonable, and there are few critics with whom a majority of unbiassed minds will more frequently be found in agreement. To discuss those points on which we might be disposed to disagree with Dr. Gloag is here impossible. It is from his own book any who disagree with him are likely to find weapons wherewith to encounter him, for it is a vast repertory of opinions and suggestions on all questions of date, authorship, and contents of the catholic epistles. It does not

broach any new theories, and it is none the worse on that account. But while it defends traditional conclusions, it does so with full and candid consideration of all that has been urged against them. Dr. Gloag maintains the authenticity of 2 Peter, although he feels himself unable to determine whether that epistle or Jude has the better claim to priority, and on other points he is equally conservative. We may reasonably desire the more piercing light and the more original criticism which genius can bring, but we need not look for a more complete digest of opinions than this acceptable volume gives us.

In Mr. Nicoll's "Theological Educator," *An Introduction to the New Testament* has been furnished by Dr. Marcus Dods. This does not profess to be more than a compilation for the use of those who are beginning this study. It is hoped that it may find its way where larger books cannot find access.

An introduction to the fourth Gospel has been written by Mr. Howard Heber Evans under the title, *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel* (Messrs. James Nisbet & Co.). This is an attempt to prove the Johannine authorship, chiefly by an examination of the phraseology and style of the Gospel. It turns the tables on those who declare it to be a psychological impossibility that the Apocalypse and the Gospel proceeded from one mind. Mr. Evans, by a careful analysis of the language of both writings, shows it to be a psychological impossibility that those two documents could have been other than the work of one and the same hand. The case he presents is a very strong one, and he presents it in a simple and lucid form, and even such critics as may repudiate his conclusion must at least be thankful for the useful tables of parallel phrases and ideas he has furnished. This is the best piece of criticism Mr. Evans has yet given us, and is indeed a solid and important contribution to the criticism of the fourth Gospel.

EXPOSITION.—To Mr. Nicoll's "Expositor's Bible" (Hodder and Stoughton) two volumes of uncommon merit have been added, the one by Prof. Findlay on *The Epistle to the Galatians*, the other by Principal Edwards on *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Readers of this magazine have learned to expect thorough work from Prof. Findlay. In his New Testament studies he has always shown independence and originality, combined with an accurate apprehension of what other scholars have ascertained. The same qualities are visible in his present volume; and it may safely be

said that no other commentary enables the reader to apprehend so readily and so accurately the meaning of this great epistle. To ascertain and expound the apostle's gospel as exhibited in *Galatians* calls for a theologian as well as a scholar. The expositor must be able to lift the mind from the exact analysis of words and phrases to those great ideas which make this epistle one of the foundation-stones of Christian doctrine. This is accomplished by Prof. Findlay. He writes with the accuracy of one who has long pondered his theme, and with the vigour and spirit of a full and eager mind.

Principal Edwards may also be congratulated on successfully achieving the difficult task of unfolding the meaning of *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. In this volume every page shows traces of careful and capable study. The epistle bristles with crucial passages for a commentator, and none but a veteran need attempt to find his way through these and to keep a firm hold on the thread that guides. However any critic may differ from Principal Edwards' interpretation of this or that passage, it will be owned that he deals with every difficulty in a straightforward and scholarly manner. It would very greatly have aided the reader if a brief introduction, indicating the scope and course of the epistle, had been prefixed to the exposition. But when one gets fairly launched in the book the stream of strong and consecutive thought carries one on. Brilliant and weighty passages relieve the strain of following the argument and quicken the attention. And it will be the opinion of every reader that Principal Edwards has produced a volume full of substance and worthy of its great theme.

Another admirable guide to the meaning of this epistle is furnished to English readers in Mr. Frederic Rendall's *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Macmillan & Co.). The same author had previously published a thoughtful and original introduction to this epistle, as well as critical and explanatory notes on the Greek text. He has now republished the introduction along with a translation of the Greek text and copious notes. These notes are free from everything that might stagger the English reader. No Greek words occur, no names of commentators or books of reference load the page. But beneath this unscholastic surface lie a scholarship as severe and a criticism as penetrating and exact as are to be found in the most learned of German commentaries. The reader at once finds himself under the guidance of a serious

and candid mind. New meaning is assigned to several words, and a new turn given to some phrases and passages; and although these will not always be approved, they are all recommended by considerations that are both interesting and weighty. We have few expositions of Scripture which will be found more incentive to thought, and certainly no one who wishes to understand the Epistle to the Hebrews should neglect Mr. Rendall's volume.

The Gospel of St. John still attracts expositors. Not only has the second volume of *The Pulpit Commentary* on the fourth Gospel been published, completing a very full and instructive book, but Dr. Thomas Whitelaw has issued with Messrs. Macle hose an exposition of the same Gospel for the use of clergymen, students, and teachers. It is named *The Gospel of St. John: an Exposition Exegetical and Homiletical*. The homiletical part, in our opinion, does injustice to the exegetical; and is besides incongruous, for those who relish the exegesis will not consult the homiletics. The exegetical part is decidedly good of its kind. It gathers all the interpretations of each phrase, and classifies them, so that the reader can choose for himself. The volume therefore represents, and will save, a vast amount of labour. Sometimes the reader desiderates a little more dogmatism on the part of Dr. Whitelaw and a little less of the mosaic of other men's opinions; but for practical purposes, probably Dr. Whitelaw's method is best. And we cannot too highly respect the painstaking diligence which every page of his work evinces. The introduction to the Gospel is a most satisfactory piece of work, full, strong, and conclusive. It would be difficult to furnish in the same space a more effective defence of the authorship of this much-debated Gospel. Altogether the book will fulfil its author's design, and be useful to clergymen, students, and teachers.

In mentioning Dr. Thomas Richey's *The Parables of the Lord Jesus according to St. Matthew*, we travel beyond our province, as the volume is published in New York. Mr. Higham, the English publisher, has however sent us a copy; and while we leave the criticism of it to Professor Warfield, we think it right meanwhile to recommend it to all who wish to see the parables treated in a more scientific manner than that which is sometimes adopted. It is a book which repays study.

Dr. Robert Johnstone, Professor of New Testament Literature in the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh, has issued two

books during the past half year. One of these is published by Messrs. Clark, and is on *The First Epistle of Peter*. It is intended to aid students of the Greek text, and is perhaps even too full in its grammatical and textual explanations. This however is a vice that leans to virtue's side; and no one will question the conscientious and painstaking diligence with which Dr. Johnstone has applied himself to the accurate ascertainment of his author's meaning. Turning to one of the crucial passages of the epistle, we find that Dr. Johnstone understands that Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison was accomplished during the lifetime and through the agency of Noah. This interpretation is scarcely compatible with the clause, τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεῖς; and although Dr. Johnstone endeavours to show that πορευθεῖς is admissible on his interpretation, we find in the numerous pages devoted to the passage no explanation of the phrase, "the spirits in prison," although it may be gathered from what is said that the imprisonment referred to is their condition after death. Dr. Johnstone's explanation of the references which the apostles made to the expected coming of Christ is not satisfactory. "Whether the apostles themselves, pondering the data which God had made known to them, thought it likely that 'the end of all things' would come during their own generation, is a question to which we are not in a position to give an answer." This assertion seems at all events a little out of place in a commentary on the words, "the end of all things is at hand." In the main however Dr. Johnstone's determination of the meaning of his author can be accepted, and as a whole the commentary is full of the fruits of sound and exact scholarship, and of serious thought. It is the best available aid to the study of the epistle with which it deals.

The other volume, issued for Dr. Johnstone by Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, is a second edition of his *Lectures on the Epistle of James*. These are popular, and are yet based on a careful examination of the text. They were delivered from the pulpit to an ordinary congregation, and are admirably adapted for preaching purposes. They give a lucid explanation of every verse, and carry out its meaning into suitable applications to life and character. Preachers will derive valuable assistance from the volume.

MARCUS DODS.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

VI. THE WAY OF SALVATION (CHAP. II. 11-18).

THIS section contains a further elucidation of the way or method of salvation in its bearing on the personal experiences of the Saviour. It may be analysed into these three parts: First, the statement of a principle on which the argument proceeds (ver. 11); second, illustrations of the principle by citations from the Old Testament (vers. 12, 13); third, applications of the principle to particular facts in the history of Jesus (vers. 14-18).

The writer at this point seems at first sight to be making a new start, looking forward rather than backward, and with the priesthood of Christ, of which express mention is made in ver. 17, specially in his eye. Further reflection however satisfies us that, as the "for" at the commencement of ver. 11 suggests, he looks backward as well as forward, and that the new truth therein enunciated has its root in the statement contained in ver. 10. The assertion that the Sanctifier and the sanctified are all of one may be conceived of as answering two questions naturally arising out of ver. 10, to which it furnishes no explicit answer. First, Christ is called the Captain or Leader of salvation: how does He contribute to salvation? Is He simply the first of a series who pass through suffering to glory? or does He influence all the sons whom God brings to glory so as to contribute very materially to the great end in view, their reaching the promised land? Second, what is the condition of His influence? what is the nexus between Him

and them, the Leader and the led, that enables Him to exert over them this power? The answer to the former question is, Christ saves by *sanctifying*; the answer to the latter, that He and the sanctified are *one*. The answer in the first case is given indirectly by the substitution of one title for another, the "Leader of salvation" being replaced by the "Sanctifier"; the answer in the second case is given directly, and forms the doctrine of the text: the Sanctifier and the sanctified are all of one.

The new designation for Christ is presumably selected because it fits in both to that view of His function suggested by the title Leader, and to that implied in the title High Priest, introduced in the sequel. No good reason can be given for limiting the reference to the latter. The probability is that the writer meant to imply that Christ sanctifies both as a Captain and as a Priest, as the Moses and as the Aaron of the great salvation. It is probable that he introduces the title "the Sanctifier" to adjust the idea of salvation to the Saviour's priestly office, but it is reasonable to suppose that he does this without any breach in the continuity of thought.

These are simple observations, but they involve a very important question; *viz.* in what sense are the terms "sanctifier" and "sanctified" used in this place? and, generally, what conception of sanctification pervades the epistle? In the ordinary theological dialect "sanctification" bears an ethical meaning, denoting the gradual renewal of his nature experienced by a believing man. The usage can be justified by New Testament texts in Paul's epistles, and as I believe also in the Epistle to the Hebrews; but the notion of holiness thus reached is secondary and derivative. In the Old Testament holiness is a religious rather than an ethical idea, and belongs properly to the sphere of worship. The people of Israel were holy in the sense of being consecrated for the service of God, the consecration being effected by

sacrifice, which purged the worshippers from the defilement of sin. It was to be expected that the ritual or theocratic idea of holiness should reappear in the New Testament, especially in an epistle like that to the Hebrews, in which Christian truth is largely stated in terms suggested by Levitical analogies. Accordingly we do find the word "sanctify" employed in the epistle in the Old Testament sense, in connexion with the priestly office of Christ, as in chapter x. 10: "sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." In such texts sanctification has more affinity with "justification" in the Pauline system of thought, than with the sanctification of dogmatic theology. But it might also be anticipated that the conception of holiness would undergo transformation under Christian influences, passing from the ritual to the ethical sphere. The source of transforming power lay in the nature of the Christian service. The sacrifices of the new era are spiritual: thankfulness, beneficent deeds, pure conduct. A good life is the Christian's service to God. Thus while formally considered sanctification might continue to mean consecration to God's service, materially it came to mean the process by which a man was enabled to live soberly, righteously, godly. Traces of this transformed meaning are to be found throughout the New Testament. The Epistle to the Hebrews is no exception to this statement. The term "holiness" (*ἁγιασμός*) is used in an ethical sense twice in the twelfth chapter. In ver. 10 it is stated that God's end in subjecting His children to paternal discipline is to make them partakers of His own holiness; in ver. 14, Christians are exhorted to follow peace with all men and holiness—holiness being prescribed as a moral task, and as an end to be reached gradually. In the one case, God is the Sanctifier through the discipline of life; in the other, Christians are summoned to sanctify themselves by a process of moral effort. In another class of texts Christ appears as a foun-

tain of sanctifying influence. The word is not used, but the thing, help to godly living, is there. "Looking unto Jesus" the Leader in faith is commended as a source of moral strength and steadfastness (xii. 2). Even in His priestly character He is set forth as a source of moral inspiration. Through Him, the great High Priest, we receive "grace for seasonable succour" (iv. 16); from Him, the tempted one, emanates aid to the tempted (ii. 18). God's paternal discipline, our own self-effort, Christ's example, priestly influence, and sympathy, all contribute to the same end, persistency and progress in the Christian life. In connexion with the first, we may say God sanctifies; in connexion with the second, we may say we sanctify ourselves; why may we not, in connexion with the third, call Christ the Sanctifier?

It thus appears that sanctification is spoken of in the epistle both in a ritual and in an ethical sense, and that Christ is represented, in effect if not in express terms, as performing the part of a sanctifier, not merely by consecrating us once for all to God by the sacrifice of Himself, but likewise by being to us in various ways a source of gracious help. This double sense of the word sanctify is analogous to the double sense of the word "righteousness" in the Pauline literature. In stating his doctrine of salvation, Paul uses the word in an objective sense. The righteousness of God is an objective righteousness, given to us for Christ's sake. But in the Pauline apologetic, in which the apostle seeks to reconcile his doctrine with apparently conflicting interests, such as the claims of the law, the prerogatives of Israel, and the demands of morality, we find the word used in a subjective sense—to denote a righteousness within us. Repelling the insinuation that we may continue in sin that grace may abound, he strives to show how every believer in Christ becomes a servant of righteousness. Even so in the Epistle to the Hebrews we find sanctification

used in a double sense, a ritual and an ethical. But there is a failure in the parallelism between the two writers in this respect, that whereas in Paul what one might call the artificial or technical sense of righteousness appears in his doctrinal statement, and the ethical sense in his apologetic, in the author of our epistle the ritual sense of sanctification appears in those parts of his writing which are dominated by his apologetic aim, and the ethical chiefly in the practical or hortatory passages, where he is set free from the trammels of his apologetic argument.¹

If it be indeed true that Christ appears in the epistle as a sanctifier in a twofold sense,—in a specific sense as a priest, in a general as a fountain of grace, then it is natural to suppose that in introducing the title “the Sanctifier,” for the first time the writer would employ it in a comprehensive sense, covering the whole extent of Christ’s sanctifying influence. This comprehensive sense, as we have seen, suits the connexion of thought, the text standing midway between two views of Christ’s function as Saviour,—that suggested by the title Captain of salvation, on the one hand, and that suggested by the title High Priest, on the other—looking back to the one and forward to the other. I feel justified therefore in putting upon the designation “the Sanctifier” this pregnant construction, and shall now proceed to consider the affirmation in ver. 11, that the Sanctifier and the sanctified are all of one.²

This statement, as indicated at the outset, I regard as the enunciation of a principle; by which is meant that

¹ Another point will come up for comparison in due course. Paul discovers in the very heart of his system a nexus between objective and subjective righteousness. Does the system of thought in this epistle provide for the union of the two kinds of sanctification? or do they stand side by side, external to each other? Are religious and ethical interests reconciled by a principle inherent in the system?

² The present participle, *οἱ ἀγιάζοντες*, fits into the view that an ethical progressive sanctification is included, but it does not prove it, for the participles may be timeless designations of the parties.

the unity asserted is involved in the relation of Sanctifier to sanctified. Whether there be only one or many exemplifications of the relation is immaterial. Though only one Sanctifier were in view or possible, the proposition would still continue to be of the nature of a principle. The point is, that Christ, as Sanctifier, must be one with those whom He sanctifies, could not otherwise perform for them that function. Some, as if bent on reducing the significance of the statement to a minimum, take it as the mere assertion of a fact: that this Sanctifier, Jesus Christ, and those whom He sanctifies are all of one God, that is, are all the children of God, the purpose of the statement being to justify the use of the title "sons" in the previous verse, or to repeat the truth implied in it. But that title, as we have seen, rests on its own foundation, the lordship of men, and needs neither justification nor repetition. Viewed as the statement of a fact, the first member of verse 11 becomes almost purposeless and superfluous. Viewed as the statement of a principle, on the other hand, it becomes a very necessary and fruitful proposition. The relative terms Sanctifier and sanctified imply one very obvious and wide difference between the parties. The Sanctifier is holy, the sanctified when He takes them in hand are unholy. That being so, it needs to be said that, notwithstanding the separation between the parties, there is a unity between them surmounting the difference. And that can be said with truth, for otherwise the two parties could not stand in the relation of Sanctifier to sanctified; they could only stand permanently apart as holy and unholy. Unity is involved in the nature of the case. That is precisely what the writer means to say. He states the truth as an axiom, which he expects even his dull-minded readers to accept immediately as true; and he means to use it as a key to the cardinal facts of Christ's human experience.

Unity to some extent or in some sense is involved, that

is clear. But in what sense, to what extent? This is not plainly indicated. The expression is ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες, "of or from one all." The style at this point becomes noticeably laconic; the sentence lacks a verb, and is worn down to the fewest words possible, after the manner of a proverb, "For the Sanctifier and the sanctified of one all." The commentators have been very much exercised over this elliptical utterance, and have made innumerable suggestions as to the noun to be supplied after "one." One seed, blood, mass, nature; or one Adam, Abraham, God. The consensus is in favour of the last. But it occurs to one to ask, Why, if he had a particular noun in his mind, did the writer not insert it, and so put an end to all doubt? Does it not look as if his purpose were to lay stress, not on descent from one God, one Divine Father, but rather on the result, the brotherhood or comradeship existing between the two parties? Is not his idea that Sanctifier and sanctified are all "of one piece, one whole,"¹ two parties welded into one, having everything in common except character? The expression ἐξ ἑνός does not necessarily imply that he is thinking of descent or origin. In the saying of our Lord, "Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice," the expression ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας means true, in sympathy with truth; so here ἐξ ἑνός may mean "one," one as a family are one, having a common interest and a common lot. The use of the connecting particle τε (ὃ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων) is in consonance with this view. It binds the two parties closely together as forming a single idea or category: Sanctifier and sanctified, all one.

We can now answer the question, To what extent one?

¹ Professor Davidson in a note, p. 66, says, "The words *all of one* might mean *all of one piece, one whole*." But he adds, "If this were the meaning, the point of unity would still lie in their common relation to God, and the unity, though wider than sonship, would embrace sonship as its chief element." He reasons, "One whole, *because sons*, the main point." I argue inversely, "*sons, therefore one whole*, one family with a common interest, the main point."

As far as possible; the more complete the unity of Sanctifier with the sanctified, the greater His power to sanctify. The nature of the relation is such as to crave unity in everything but the one ineffaceable distinction of character. From whatever point of view, the ritual or the ethical, we regard the Sanctifier's function, this becomes apparent on reflection. Conceive Christ first as Sanctifier in the ethical sense, as Captain or Leader of salvation; it is evident that in that capacity it behoved Him to be in all possible respects one with those He took in hand to sanctify. For in this case the sanctifying power of Jesus lies in His example, His character, His history as a man. He makes men believing in Him holy by reproducing in His own life the lost ideal of human character, and bringing that ideal to bear on their minds; by living a true, godly life amid the same conditions of trial as those by which they are surrounded, and helping them to be faithful by inspiration and sympathy. The more genuinely human He is, and the more closely the conditions of His human life resemble ours, the greater His influence over us. His power to sanctify depends on likeness in nature, position, and experience.

Conceive Christ next as Sanctifier in the ritual sense, as a priest, consecrating us for the service of God by the sacrifice of Himself; and the same need for a pervading, many-sided unity is apparent. The priest must be one with his clients in God's sight, their accepted representative; so that what He does is done in their name and avails for their benefit. He must be one with them in death, for it is by His death in sacrifice that He makes propitiation for their sins. He must be one with them in the possession of humanity, for unless He become partaker of human nature He cannot die. Finally, He must be one with them in experience of trial and temptation, for thereby is demonstrated the sympathy which wins trust, and unless the priest be trusted it is in vain that He transacts.

All these unities except the first are unfolded in the sequel of the second chapter, and are common to the two aspects of Christ's function as the Sanctifier. The first unity, that before God, is peculiar to the priestly office, and is reserved for mention at a later stage, when the priesthood of Christ becomes the subject of formal consideration.¹

Having enunciated this great principle of unity, the writer next proceeds to show that it has its root in Old Testament Scripture. The manner in which he does this is very lively and impressive. In abstract language the import is this: "The unity asserted implies a brotherly relation between Sanctifier and sanctified. But traces of such a brotherhood are discernible in the Old Testament, as in the following passages, where Messiah appears saying, 'I will declare Thy name unto My brethren'; 'I will put My trust in Him'; 'Behold, I and the children which God hath given Me.'" But the writer does not put the matter in this cold, colourless way. He introduces his quotations in an animated, rhetorical manner with the spirit-stirring sentiment, "for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren." Observing that the quoted passages are all of the nature of personal declarations or exclamations, observing also that they are all utterances of an impassioned character, he strives to reflect the spirit of the original texts in his own language. Therefore he says not, Messiah is represented as the brother of men, but He calls Himself their brother; and not content with that, he introduces another word to bring out the fact that Messiah does not barely admit or reluctantly acknowledge the brotherhood, but proclaims it with ardour and enthusiasm, rejoicing, glorying therein. "He is not *ashamed* to call them brethren. On the contrary, He calls them brethren with all His heart, with the fervour of love, with the eloquence of earnest conviction." The reference to shame points

¹ *Vide* chapter v. 1.

significantly to the one cardinal difference, sin, which constitutes the temptation to the Holy One to be ashamed.

The quotations so spiritedly introduced are well selected for the purpose in hand. In all brotherhood is expressed or clearly implied. In the first, the speaker, primarily the psalmist,¹ represents himself as a member of a congregation of worshippers whom he calls his brethren; in the second, the speaker, primarily the prophet Isaiah,² declares his purpose to trust God, implying that he is in a situation of trial in which trust is necessary; in the third, taken from the same place,³ he associates himself with the children God has given him, as of the same family and sharing the same prophetic vocation. The utterances put into the mouth of Messiah imply brotherhood in worship and in trying experience, and even the closer kind of brotherhood involved in family connexions and a common calling.

We now come to the applications of the principle enunciated in verse 11. They are three in number, together covering the whole earthly history of Christ, beginning with His birth, and ending with His death. Incarnation, sorrowful experience, death, such are the three grand exemplifications of the brotherly unity of the Sanctifier with the sanctified; not arranged however in this order, the second changing places with the third, because the incarnation is exhibited in subordination to the death as a means to an end: Christ took flesh that He might die. The applications are as obvious as they are important. If the principle has validity and value, it must and will prove true in those particulars. What we have to do therefore is not to justify these deductions, but to study the terms in which

¹ Ps. xxii. 23.

² Isa. viii. 17, as in Septuagint. The rendering in the English version is, "I will look for Him."

³ Isa. viii. 18.

they are expressed, which are in many respects curious and instructive.

First comes the incarnation (ver. 14). The sanctified are here referred to in terms borrowed from the last of the three quotations, "the children." The use of this designation is not only rhetorically graceful but logically apt, as suggesting the idea of an existence derived from birth. Children is an appropriate name for men as born of blood, and therefore possessing blood and flesh. These terms, "blood and flesh," in their turn are employed to denote human nature as mortal, as it exists under the conditions of this earthly life; for flesh and blood have no place in the eternal life. Of man's mortal nature, as thus designated, Christ is said to have taken part *παράλληλως*, "likewise," similarly. The scope of the whole passage requires that this word be emphasised, so that the similarity may be as great as possible. Therefore not merely is participation in man's mortal flesh implied, but entrance into human nature by the same door as other men—by birth. We may not, with Irving and the Adoptianists, include sinfulness in the likeness, for the application of the principle of unity is necessarily limited by the personal holiness of the Sanctifier. The rule is, Like in all things, sin excepted.

The second application of the principle is to the death of Christ, which, as already indicated, is next mentioned because it supplies the *rationale* of the incarnation (vers. 14b, 15). As a mere corollary to the principle it would have been enough to have said, Because the brethren die, He too died. But the objection might be raised, Why should the sinless One die, if, as we have been taught, death be the penalty of sin? Therefore the application of the principle to the death of Christ is so stated as to bring out at the same time the service He thereby rendered to His brethren. This is done however in a very peculiar way, which has greatly perplexed commentators. The difficulty arises in

part from our trying to put too much theology into the passage, and to bring its teaching into line with other more familiar modes of exhibiting the significance of Christ's death. It must be recognised once for all that the writer has various ways of showing that it behoved Christ to die, and that he gladly avails himself of any way that tends to throw light on a subject ill-understood by his readers. This is one of the ways, and although from its isolation in the epistle it looks obscure and forbidding, the text yields a good, clear, intelligible sense, if we will be content not to find in it the whole mystery and theory of the atonement. For the materials of explanation we do not need to go outside the Bible : they are evidently to be found in the account of the fall in the third chapter of Genesis. According to that account death came into the world because Adam sinned, tempted by the serpent. The text before us is a free paraphrase of that account. The serpent is identified with the devil, death is represented as a source of slavish fear, embittering human life, because it is the penalty of sin ; the power of death is ascribed to the devil, because he is the tempter to sin which brought death into the world, and the accuser of those who sin, so that they, having sin brought to mind, fear to die. Christ destroys the devil by destroying his power, and He destroys his power by freeing mortal men from the cruel bondage of the fear of death.

All this is plain enough. But the question now arises, How did Christ through death free from the fear of death ? We, steeped in theology, would naturally reply, By offering Himself an atoning sacrifice for sin. But that is certainly not the writer's thought here. He reserves the great thought of Christ's priestly self-sacrifice for a more advanced stage in the development of his doctrine. What then is his thought ? Simply this. Christ delivers from the fear of death by dying *as a sinless one*. Death and sin are connected very intimately in our minds, hence fear. But

lo, here is one who knows no sin dying. The bare fact breaks the association between sin and death. But more than that: He who dies is our brother, has entered into our mortal state in a fraternal spirit for the very purpose of lending us a helping hand. We may not fully know how His death avails to help us. But we know that the Sanctifier in a spirit of brotherhood became one with us, even in death; and the knowledge enables us to realize our unity with Him in death, and so emancipates us from fear. "Sinners may die, for the Sinless has died." The benefit thus derived from the death of the sinless One is but the other side of the great principle, Sanctifier and sanctified all one. For it has two sides, it applies both ways. The Sanctifier becomes one with the sanctified in brotherly love; the sanctified become one with the Sanctifier in privilege. They are mutually one in both directions in God's sight; they are mutually one in both directions for the spiritual instincts of the believer, even before he knows what the twofold validity for God means. In proportion as we realize the one aspect of the principle, the Sanctifier one with us, we are enabled to realize and get benefit from the other. While the Holy One stands apart from us in the isolation of His sinlessness, we, sinners, fear to die; when we see Him by our side, even in death, which we have been accustomed to regard as the penalty of sin, death ceases to appear as penalty, and becomes the gate of heaven.¹

¹ So in effect Professor Davidson, p. 70. Rendall, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1888, renders the last clause of ver. 14, "that through *His* death He might bring to nought him that had the power of *that* death," limiting the devil's power to the death of Christ. He takes the article *τοῦ* before *θανάτου* as referring to a particular instance of death. But it is rather a case of the article prefixed to abstracts. *Ὁ θάνατος* is simply death as a familiar human experience. The omission of the article in ver. 15 makes no difference, it is still the abstract idea of death. The use of the article with abstracts, though usual, is not necessary. Having referred to this writer, I take occasion to remark that he must be added to the number of those who regard the reference of the crowning in ver. 9 to the state of exaltation as inadmissible. He however relegates it, not to the earthly, but to the pre-incarnate state.

Thus with consummate tact does the writer turn the one thing that divides Christ from ordinary men, and seems to disable Him for helping them, into a source of consolation. Sanctifier, that presupposes sinlessness; sanctified, that presupposes sin; and being sinners we fear to die. Yes; but the sinless One died, and we feeling our unity with Him cease to fear. He cannot be one with us in sin, but He is one with us in that which comes nearest to sin, and derives all its terror from sin.

Before passing to the third application of the principle, the writer throws in a truism to relieve the argument and make it more intelligible to persons to whom the train of thought is new and strange (ver. 16). Simply rendered, what the verse states is this: "For, as you know, it is not of angels that He taketh hold (to be their Helper), but He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham." The rendering of the Authorized Version (an inheritance from patristic times) is due apparently to inability to conceive of the writer penning so self-evident a truth as that Christ did not undertake to save angels. That inability again is due to failure to gauge the spiritual ignorance of his Hebrew readers. To the same cause it is due that some recent commentators have not been content to regard ver. 16 as the statement of a truism, but have laboured hard to assign to it an important place in the chain of argument. To me this text is one of the most significant indications of the dark condition of the Hebrew Christians in reference to the nature of Christianity. They were so little at home, it appears, in Christian truth, that nothing could be taken for granted, and they had to be coaxed like children to engage in the most elementary process of thought on the subject. Such coaxing I find here. The writer stops short in his argument, and says in effect: "Please to remember that Christ is not the Saviour of the angels of whom I have lately been speaking, but of men, and reflect on what

that implies, and it will help you to go along with me in this train of thought." But we observe that he does not say, Christ taketh hold of *men*, but, "of the seed of Abraham." We must beware of attaching too much importance to this, as if the reference implied that the Christian salvation concerned only the people of Israel. Here again the apologetic exigences and aim are our best guide. The writer is not enunciating a theological proposition, but having recourse to an oratorical device to bring home his teaching to the hearts of his readers. He means to say, "Christ took in hand to save, not angels, but yourselves, my Hebrew brethren." His argument up to this point has been stated in terms applicable to all mankind; to charge it with a warmer tone and an intenser interest he gives it now a homeward-bound turn. To infer from this, that he considered the gospel the affair of the Jews, is to sink to the rabbinical level in exposition. At the same time it may be noted, that the introduction of a reference to Israel at this point is convenient, as from this point onwards the writer is to speak of things in which persons belonging to the chosen people were specially interested.

The writer now resumes and completes his application of the principle enunciated in verse 11, giving prominence in the final instance to Christ's experience of temptation (vers. 17, 18). In doing so he takes occasion from the parenthetical remark about the subjects of Christ's saving work (ver. 16) to make a new start, and go over the ground again with variations. The thoughts contained in these closing sentences are similar to those expressed in verses 14, 15. Here, as there, it is inferred from the fact that the subjects of Christ's work are men, that He must have a human nature and experience likewise. Here also, as there, the ends served by the assumption of human nature and endurance of a human experience are set forth. But neither in stating the fact of the incarnation nor in ex-

plaining its end does the writer repeat himself. He varies not only the forms of expression, but also the aspects under which he presents the truth, so as to give to his unfolding of the doctrine variety, richness, and fulness. While before he said that because the children were partakers of blood and flesh Christ also took part of the same, here he says that for the same reason it behoved Christ in all things to be made like unto His brethren. And whereas in the former place he set it forth as the end of the incarnation to deprive the devil of his power over man through death, and to rob death itself of its terrors, in this concluding passage he represents the human experience of Jesus as serving these two ends: first, the fitting of Him to transact as a priest for men towards God; and second, the qualifying of Him for being a sympathetic friend in need to all the tempted.

To be noted specially are the terms in which the unity between the Sanctifier and the sanctified is stated here. It behoved Him to be *in all respects* (κατὰ πάντα) made like unto His brethren. Likeness is asserted without qualification, and yet there are limits arising out of the nature of the case. One limit of course is that there can be no likeness in moral character. This limit is implied in the very titles applied to the two parties, Sanctifier and sanctified, and it is expressly stated in the place where Christ is represented as "tempted in all respects similarly, apart from sin" (iv. 15). Another limit, nowhere referred to in words, but tacitly assumed is, that the likeness is in those respects only in which our life on earth is affected by the curse pronounced on man for sin. Overlooking this principle, we might fail to be impressed with the likeness of Jesus to other men in His experience; we might even be impressed with a sense of unlikeness. There are respects in which Christ's life was unlike the common life of men. He was a celibate; He died young, and had no experience

of the temptations of middle life, or the infirmities of old age; in outward lot He was the brother of the poor, and was well acquainted with their griefs, but of the joys and temptations of wealth He had no experience. But these features of difference do not fall under the category of the curse. Family ties date from before the fall. The doom pronounced on man was death immediate, and prolonged life is a mitigation of the curse. Wealth too is a mitigating feature, another evidence that the curse has not been executed in rigour, but has remained to a considerable extent an unrealized ideal, because counteracted by an underlying redemptive economy. It will be found that Christ's likeness to His brethren is closest just where the traces of the curse are most apparent: in so far as this life is (1) afflicted with poverty, (2) exposed to temptations to ungodliness, (3) subject to death under its more manifestly penal forms, as when it comes as a blight in early life, or as the judicial penalty of crime. Jesus was like His brethren in proportion as they need His sympathy and succour, like the poor, the tempted, the criminal.

This likeness had for its final cause that the Sanctifier might become an effective helper of those to whom He was thus made like.

"That He might be a merciful and trusty High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people." These weighty words form an important landmark in the epistle, as containing the first express mention of a topic which the writer has had in view from the outset, and on which he will have much to say in the sequel; viz. the Priesthood of Christ. He has now arrived at a point in his argument at which he can introduce the great thought with some chance of being understood; though how well aware he is of the difficulty likely to be felt by his readers in taking it in appears from the fact that, immediately after announcing the new theme, he invites them to consider

carefully the Apostle and High Priest of their confession (iii. 1). In effect he says: "Now this is a great and glorious but for you difficult topic: give your minds to it; come, study it with me, it will well repay your pains." Here he does little more than introduce the subject. The priestly function of Christ he describes in general terms as exercised towards God and as consisting in the expiation of sin. No mention as yet of the means of propitiation, "gifts and sacrifices" (v. 1); still less of the fact that Christ accomplishes the result by the sacrifice of *Himself*. He will take care not to introduce that master-thought till he can do so with effect. Here on the threshold of the subject he gives prominence rather to the moral qualities of a well equipped High Priest, mercifulness and trustworthiness; moved partly by a regard to the connexion of thought, and partly by a desire to present Christ as Priest in a winsome light. The stress laid on these attributes is one of the originalities of the epistle, whether we have regard to the legal requirements for the priestly office as specified in the Pentateuch, or to the view of Christ's atoning work presented by other New Testament writers. It is one of the writer's favourite themes.

Of the two attributes the former is the chief, for he who is merciful, compassionate, will be faithful. It is want of sympathy that makes officials perfunctory. Hence we might read "a merciful and therefore a faithful, trustworthy High Priest." So reading we see the close connexion between the experiences of Christ and His fitness for the priestly office. For all can understand how an experience of trial and temptation might help to make Christ compassionate, while it is not so easy to see why it behoved Him to suffer *all* He suffered in order to perform the essential duty of a Priest—that of atoning for sin. One might think that for the latter purpose it were enough to die; but to insure that a High Priest should be heart and soul interested in His

constituents, it behoved Him to be made in all respects like unto His brethren.

The other end served by Jesus being made in all things like His brethren is thus stated: "*For having Himself been tempted in that which He suffered, He is able to succour those who are being tempted.*" This rendering of verse 18 is one of several possible ones which it is not necessary to enumerate or discuss, as the general sense is plain; viz. that Christ having experienced temptation to be unfaithful to His vocation in connexion with the sufferings arising out of it, previously alluded to as a source of perfecting, is able to succour those who, like the Hebrew Christians, were tempted in similar ways to be unfaithful to their Christian calling. The words show us, not so much a different part of Christ's ministry as Priest, as a different aspect of it. In the previous verse His work is looked at in relation to sinners for whose sins He makes propitiation. In this verse, on the other hand, that work is looked at in relation to believers needing daily succour amid the temptations to which they are exposed. Both aspects are combined when, farther on, mercy and grace for seasonable succour are named as the things to be sought in our petitions at the throne of grace (iv. 16).

A. B. BRUCE.

THE GROUP OF THE APOSTLES.

I.

THE scriptural accounts of the Apostles are both interesting and important, even if we only regard them as pieces of character-painting by the same artists who have drawn for us the amazing figure of Jesus.

For the character of our Lord is an evidence, now thoroughly recognised and established. It is not only by His spiritual pre-eminence that the student is impressed, but also by the verisimilitude of various and minute details, related by four writers of widely different style, temperament, and tastes. All of them show us the same dexterity in debate, in teaching the same sweetness and love of illustrations, the same resort for these to the homely and everyday side of nature and human life, the same penetrating gaze, the same gentle helpfulness, the same indignation moved by certain respectable vices, and the same astonishing tolerance when sinners against whom society cries out appeal to Him. We feel that such harmony could never have been preserved by a series of deifying myths of a later period, and therefore that the narratives which sceptical criticism admits authenticate the rest. And this portrait, so impressive and sharply cut, exists in defiance of all the laws of dramatic characterization. Shakespeare created no faultless man. The blameless king of Tennyson is but a shadow. Milton and Renan, and hundreds more, with the model before them, have failed to reproduce a "Christ in white marble, . . . without sin . . . simple and pure as the sentiment which creates it."¹ Only four contemporaries ever described a perfect yet lifelike character; and these were an exciseman, a physician, and two fishers, since we must

¹ *Vie de Jésus Pop.* 29th ed., p. 7.

recognise the hand of Peter in the second gospel. These only have succeeded in painting a face without shadows, and the natural explanation of their success is that they actually beheld the countenance which is, in the moral heaven, as the sun shineth in his strength.

No belief which men allow themselves to reject offhand because it is "contrary to experience" can be more so than their achievement. It is miraculous, according to the boldest definition of a miracle, unless we are to ignore the existence of laws of literature and of mind. And it continues to be miraculous, even when the sceptic substitutes his own theory of the authorship of the gospels.

Whatever reinforcement this argument needs it may draw from the treatment of the twelve Apostles in the same documents. They too are persons with whom legend and myth might well busy themselves, foundation stones of the celestial city, throned assessors in the final judgment of mankind. How then are they represented by the evangelists? Are they glorious and blameless, betraying the untrustworthy nature of the romances which delight us? Sceptical theories would lead us to expect this, but it is not what we find in the Bible. Let any one compare the Gospels with the *Acta Sanctorum*, and he will know all the difference between history and legend. If there is nothing to be recorded about them which helps the central narrative they are left in perfect obscurity, such as conceals Bartholomew. Whatever is related is homely, substantial, and matter of fact. We see them quarrelling about the mastery, and whispering among themselves when they have no bread, and the words of the Master perplex them. We see the fisherman girding on his coat, the troubled group asleep for sorrow, and again incredulous for joy, the nervous blow that misses the skull and only cuts off the ear, the utterly disheartened love which reckons up the five deadly wounds, and wrongly thinks that belief in the

resurrection will be impossible until it has verified them all. In all this we find the best of evidence that no mythical tendency created the strange and majestic Figure in the midst, so unlike these or any other men; yet no blurred outline, fuller of humanity than the most human, at once the most manlike and the most unearthly.

In studying the Apostles, several lines of thought may be kept in view. What has just been indicated may be observed in detail, the homely verisimilitude of the narratives, quite free from any tendency to apotheosis or even canonization. We may take notice that the part assigned to them in the fourth Gospel is exactly and minutely similar to that which they hold in the other three.

Or we may inquire what it was that recommended these plain men for the supreme rank among mankind. The answer will not be found in the possession of qualities then reckoned admirable, the wisdom or learning or nobility of the Greek world. They were all to come to nought, as a needful step in the development of that regenerate manhood which would find its true nobility only by despising them. Attainments were not rejected, or Saul of Tarsus would not have been a chosen vessel; yet they took a very secondary place among the qualifications for that first and grandest crusade, wherein the heroes who went forth conquering and to conquer were sheep in the midst of wolves, Jews among the Greeks and Galileans among the Jews.

Nor is there a trace of the still poorer wisdom of the modern world, the cleverness by which fortunes are made or competing politicians "dished," what our American friends call *smartness*. They are only worldly wise in so far as they are falling from grace.

But there is a very great deal of what is far more precious (and often wins a more enduring fame even beyond the limits of the Church), the unaffected human nature which

Christ redeemed; the simple, rich, primitive instincts which do not belong to man as a cultivated nor yet as a fallen being, but as man, the creature whom God made and Christ redeemed. They are persons in whom Shakespeare would have taken a much greater interest than Pope.

Yet another point has to be borne in mind which is too much forgotten. Except by glimpses in the Acts, we see disciples rather than Apostles, recruits in training for the great war, not veterans justifying their commission. We know not how Andrew bore himself in Scythia, nor Thomas in India; we are not even assured of the places where they really fulfilled their ministry. The criticisms, far too free and slighting, which assail them lose much of their force when we remember that almost all the services they rendered are unrecorded save in the book of life, human fame being nothing accounted of by these followers of the Lamb.

The present paper is an endeavour to collect some of the indications by which we may form a notion of the apostolic group. What is individual, personal, characteristic of the fire of Peter or the gloom of Thomas will be treated hereafter. Meantime it is hoped that a comparison of the scattered notes which concern the Twelve, or "the disciples" (as far as that title obviously includes them, with whom, or even a section of them, it is at times synonymous)¹ may not be without interest.

1. The painters represent our Saviour moving along the country in the centre of a group of comrades who gather about Him as they please. But it is much more probable that they travelled in three ranks, following their Master. At first sight there is little or no agreement in the arrangement of the four lists given to us in the synoptical Gospels and the Acts (Matt. x. 2, Mark iii. 16, Luke vi. 14, Acts i. 13). But we soon discover that the twelve names may be subdivided into three groups of four, and none is ever

¹ Cf. Luke xvii. ver. 1 with ver. 5; Matt. xxiv. 3 with Mark xiii. 3.

found in any subdivision except his own, while the names of Peter, Philip, and the second James are always at the head of their group, and the first rank is composed of the mighty brothers, the sons of Jonas and of Zebedee. All this is best accounted for by supposing that the groups were actually thus arranged, and that each had a sort of captain at its head.

On the last journey to Jerusalem, it is explicitly stated that Jesus went before, and as they followed they were afraid (Mark x. 32). Now this, if it stood alone, might only express the holy earnestness with which He then especially came to do the will of God. His rapt devotion is evidently the cause of their awe. But their order in going harmonizes with the call, "Come ye after Me," with the warning, "Whosoever doth not . . . follow Me cannot be My disciple," and with the going of the Good Shepherd before the sheep (Matt. iv. 19, x. 38; John x. 4). So too when Peter pressed upon Him with a too carnal sympathy, Jesus first turned about, and then, seeing His disciples, rebuked him (Mark viii. 33; cf. also Matt. viii. 19, 23, and many other places).

2. Since they were chiefly men of outdoor, hardy avocations, one might fairly expect them to be capable of more physical exertion than their Master, whose lifelong occupation had been more sedentary, and upon whom an unprecedented burden always pressed. Accordingly, we find them permitted to go forward to Sychar for provisions, while their Lord sat beside the well in an attitude which expressed His weariness. And they could row hard across the lake, while Jesus had sunk into deep slumber upon the helmsman's cushion in the stern (John iv. 6, Mark. iv. 38).

3. The manner in which they are helpful to Him is very natural. As Paul was not sent to baptize, so Jesus Himself baptized not, but from the first entrusted to them a duty which made no premature demand upon their spiritual

insight (John iv. 1). And when they were first sent out to preach, their teaching was but rudimentary: the near approach of the kingdom, rather than any statement of its nature; the signs which were evidence of their commission; the goodwill expressed in their greeting; and the confidence which threw itself upon their hearers for supplies, and lacked nothing,—these, and an indignant protest against such as rejected them, served to prepare the villagers for His coming, and to develop their own faith, while not overstraining it (Matt. x. 5). But this is scarcely the gospel which a later age would have entrusted to them.

Elsewhere their duties are sufficiently humble. They buy bread at Sychar, they find what provision is among the hungry crowds, they sever the multitudes into less unwieldy groups, they bring the colt and prepare the pass-over (John iv. 8; Mark vi. 38-43; Matt. xxi. 2, xxvi. 17).

It is at the end of His ministry that the Master who has, He reminds them, already called them friends, calls them no longer bondservants (John xv. 15).

4. There is help which might have been expected, but which they fail to render. They neither interpose when He is in danger at Nazareth, nor again when He conveyed Himself away from the Pool of Bethesda, and the Jews sought to kill Him (Luke iv. 30; John v. 13, 18). This absence of heroism, while yet their training is immature, appears also in another way. It is a curious indication of the awe which Jesus inspired, that His opponents, especially in the earlier controversies, impugned His doings, not to His face, but in murmurs among themselves or else to His followers, while they often ventured to question Him about the strange doings of His disciples.

Of Him they ask, "Why do they on the Sabbath day that which is not lawful?" "Why walk not Thy disciples according to the tradition, . . . but eat with unwashen hands?" "Why do Thy disciples fast not?" "Master,

rebuke Thy disciples" (Mark ii. 24, vii. 5; Matt. ix. 14; Luke xix. 39).

It is to them that they say, "Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?" "Doth not your Master pay tribute?" (Matt. ix. 11, xviii. 24.)

Now St. John tells us that this very fear of coming to close quarters with Jesus suggested grave inferences to some shrewd bystanders, who asked, "Is not this He whom they seek to kill?"¹ But, lo, He speaketh openly, and they say nothing unto Him" (John vii. 25, 26). But whether He is questioned or they, it is always He who interposes with a reply: on their part is the same helplessness as when the danger was physical, the same which in the garden contrasted so sharply with His self-possession, when by His surrender He secured their liberty to "go their way."

No sooner do they hear of the murder of the Baptist than their first missionary circuit closes at once, and they hasten back to their Protector (Mark vi. 29, 30).

So true are the words of the great prayer, "While I was with them, I kept them: . . . and I guarded them. . . . But now I come to Thee. . . . I pray . . . that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil one" (John xvii. 12-15).

5. Their subordination is the least part of what we learn from the memorable fact that Jesus never invites them to join with Him in prayer, nor solicits their prayers for Him. The disciples are to pray the Lord of the harvest that He would send forth labourers, but He does not propose to lead them in this prayer; on the contrary, it is at this very time that He continues all night in prayer alone (cf. Matt. ix. 38, x. 1; Luke vi. 12).

Again, when they saw Him praying they seem to have

¹ Observe the further coincidence that the people, gathered from all parts to the feast, said, "Thou hast a devil, who goeth about to kill Thee?" But "some of them of Jerusalem" knew better (vers. 20, 25).

felt their exclusion, and asked to be taught to pray, as John had taught his disciples; and as if to rebuke them for being dissatisfied with the brief prayer He had already given to all, they received it again in a form still terser and more concentrated (Luke xi. 1). Sleep weighed upon them in the mount of transfiguration, while He prayed. In the garden they are bidden to watch with Him, and again to watch and pray, but not to pray with Him (Luke ix. 29-32; Matt. xxvi. 36-41). On the contrary, they must tarry while He goes farther to pray. To St. Paul, the intercessions of his followers were priceless; and they who deny that the synoptical gospels reveal a union between Christ and the Father wholly different from ours have to explain this remarkable divorce between the prayers of Jesus and of the Twelve.

6. This task will not be lightened for them by observing that in other respects there exists a homely kind of intimacy, such as prays Him, saying, "Rabbi, eat," and with deeper solicitude inquires, "Lord, the Jews of late sought to stone Thee, and goest Thou thither again?" The remonstrance, "How sayest Thou, Who touched Me?" is akin with that in St. John, "Lord, if he is fallen asleep he will recover." With like freedom they interrupt His prayerful retirement, because "all men seek Thee," and they ask, "Knowest Thou that the Pharisees were offended at this saying?" They desired Him to send away the multitudes because the place was desert and the day far spent; and the woman of Canaan, because her outcry drew attention to them when it was desirable that they should be hid (John iv. 31, xi. 8; Luke viii. 45; John xi. 12; Luke ix. 12; Matt. xv. 23).

There is something homely and interesting in their pointing His attention to the size of the Temple stones, just two days after He had predicted that one stone should not be left upon another. And it marks the difference between the region of His thought and theirs, that the day and

almost the hour should be the same when He called the disciples unto Him to point out a generous widow, and when they came to Him for to show Him the buildings of the Temple. In the same familiar way they remarked to Him the speedy ruin of the fig tree which He had cursed (Mark xii. 43; Matt. xxiv. 1, xxi. 20).

The same absence of restraint appears in the questions which they ask of Him, sometimes little more than curious, even when they relate to spiritual concerns. "Are there few that be saved?" "Dost Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" "Who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" "Speakest Thou these things unto us, or unto all?" (Luke xiii. 23; Acts i. 6; John ix. 2; Luke xii. 41.)

A graver note was struck when they asked, "Who then can be saved?" "Why could we not cast it out?" "Why speakest Thou unto them in parables?" "Declare unto us the parable of the tares." "Who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" Thus too they reopened privately the subject of divorce, and inferred that it was not good for a man to marry (Matt. xix. 25, xvii. 19, xiii. 10, 36, xviii. 1; Mark x. 10; Matt. xix. 10).

7. These questions prove that it was no servile dread of being repulsed, but awe, as in the presence of a Being from another sphere, which so often hushed their perplexities into silence. This silence moreover is most frequent when the rapt self-devotion of their Lord is most apparent. "They marvelled that He spake with a woman," yet none asked for an explanation, and it was among themselves that they inquired, "Hath any man brought Him ought to eat?" At His first cleansing of the Temple, they silently recalled to mind that it was written, "The zeal of Thine house hath even eaten Me." Jesus knew that they were desirous to ask Him, "What is this that He saith, A little while?" (John iv. 27, 33; ii. 17; xvi. 19.)

All these examples are from the fourth gospel, but they are exactly similar to what we read elsewhere about their perplexity when warned against the leaven of the Pharisees. When He cursed the fig tree, we read that the disciples heard it, evidently in silence. And at three several times, when warned of His approaching passion, they could not understand, yet feared to ask Him (Mark viii. 15 ; xi. 14 ix. 10, 32 ; x. 32).

All this coherence in statement, equally between the synoptics and John, and between miraculous events and those which are admitted practically by all sides in the great controversy, is valuable evidence. It carries the same conviction which a jury feels when a witness bears the test of cross-examination well, a test which is all the more valuable when it deals with unstudied and minute events.

We now turn to the concerns of their spiritual life.

8. The effect of Christ's protest against formalism, and His miracles upon the Sabbath, appears most naturally in their plucking the corn in the wheatfield and eating bread with unwashen hands, contrary to the tradition of "all the Jews" (Mark ii. 23, vii. 2). It was not unnatural that they should hold their new freedom with an unsteady hand. Yet it was strangely soon after Jesus had vindicated their liberty, and offended the Pharisees by declaring that man is not defiled by food which enters the mouth, but by evil words which issue thence, that they misunderstood His warning against the leaven of the Pharisees, and suspected some new ceremonialism of His institution. Their previous experience was what entitled Him to ask, "Do ye not yet perceive, neither understand?" and again, "Do ye not yet understand?" (Mark vii. 15, viii. 18, 21.)

In fact, at this point our Lord addressed to them the keenest and longest remonstrance they had yet incurred. For so distinct a relapse into formalism from liberty indicated the earliest peril of the Church, and foreshadowed the

movement which evoked, a few years later, the passionate remonstrances addressed by St. Paul to Corinth and Galatia. How many later movements also, wherein the wilful human heart, ever the same amid its inconsistencies, has preferred the letter to the spirit, were due to the very principle which underlay the first heresy of the chosen ones of Christ!

9. The gradual progress of their enlightenment is not only indicated by the mention of things which they cannot bear yet, and of actions which they know not now, but shall know hereafter (John xvi. 12, xiii. 7), but by the process of the narrative.

When the miracle of Cana manifested forth His glory, His disciples believed on Him. Yet, when He presently spake of the Temple of His Body, we read that after He was raised from the dead His disciples remembered that He spake this; and believed the Scripture, and the words that Jesus had said. They had not been hitherto incredulous of either, but now their belief attained its intelligent, perfect form. And at many intervening experiences they adored Him, "saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God," and, "Now are we sure; . . . by this we know that Thou camest forth from God" (John ii. 11, 22; Matt. xiv. 33; John xvi. 29, 30).

And this explains how the confession of Nathanael, lightly spoken at the opening of the work, became no less than a decisive revelation from the Father when renewed by Peter, in the days of bitter opposition and desertion. "Thou art the Son of God; Thou art King of Israel," is not otherwise behind the great confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (John i. 49; Matt. xvi. 16). But Nathanael only repeated, amid favourable circumstances, the witness of the Baptist (ver. 34), while Peter testified from a divinely illumined faith what "flesh and blood" had ceased to confess, now thinking Him no more than one of the prophets.

10. This gradual falling away of others was itself a part of their training. Merely to stand firm was to be confirmed, as the tree which has borne the storm has become more deeply rooted. And if there is an evident mixture of self-interest with their devotion, if Peter is the mouthpiece of all when he demands, "What shall we have therefore?" (Luke xviii. 28) he also speaks for all, when Jesus gives them the opportunity of retreat by asking, "Would ye also go away?" and he replies, "Lord, to whom should we go? Thou hast words of eternal life. And we, we have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God" (John vi. 67-69). In this fine answer we discover the sacred hunger which shall be filled. To return to the lake and the net is not even considered. They must have a leader now, and there is no leader except One: "Lord, to WHOM should we go?"

Their fidelity amid extreme discouragement (a grace which is not inconsistent with panic in the hour of the foe and the power of darkness) is evidently their greatest merit. "Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations." "They have kept My word." "I guarded them, and not one of them perished." "These knew that Thou hast sent Me" (Luke xxii. 28; John xvii. 6, 12, 25). Even the blow which shattered their hopes did not prevent them from being a united band; and if they believe not, it is for joy (Luke xxiv. 33, 41).

11. Their failures are those of weakness, not of ungracious hearts. Perplexity when they have no bread, drowsiness in the mount, and sleep "for sorrow" in the garden, natural dread in the two storms and upon the arrest of Jesus, failure to cast out a devil when both He and the foremost of their company are absent, these represent one aspect of human frailty, and are all exceedingly consistent (Mark viii. 16; Luke ix. 32, xxii. 45; Matt. viii. 25, xiv. 26; Luke ix. 40).

Another aspect of it is betrayed in their frequent contests for mastery, their indignation when the sons of Salome covertly intrigue for the chief places, their forbidding the labours of one who followed not "us" (they say not, Thee), in their inquiry whether words of especial privilege were spoken to themselves alone, in their repeated failure to value children aright,¹ and in that reluctance to wash the feet of the brethren which left that lowly task for their Master to perform for all of them (Luke ix. 46, xxii. 24; Matt. xx. 24; Mark ix. 38; Luke xii. 41; John xiii. 4, 14).

What kind of frailty was that which forsook Him in the garden? Cruel things are spoken by flippant orators (who have perhaps never in all their lives known real danger, and yet have sometimes been afraid) concerning the "cowardice" of the men whom Christ chose out of all the world. But the narrative tells us that Jesus declared the spirit to be willing, though the flesh was weak. Although suddenly aroused from slumber, and apparently weighed upon by the same supernatural pressure against which Christ wrestled, and of which He warned them,² yet they boldly confronted the great multitude of armed men, and "when they saw what would follow" proposed to "smite with the sword" (Matt. xxvi. 41; Luke xxii. 49). In danger they bore themselves gallantly, it was the surrender that appalled them. Now the sternest nerve has often failed in strange and unexpected peril, and the bravest troops have given way to panic. We forfeit the instruction of their overthrow when we speak of them as dastards. It is by remembering all that they afterwards dared, and all that they were even then willing to hazard, as long as

¹ "Take heed that ye despise not"; "The disciples rebuked those that brought them" (Matt. xviii. 10, xix. 13).

² Cf. the injunction when He was at the place to "pray lest ye enter into temptation," and again, later, "Watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation," with His mysterious and emphatic words when arrested, "This is . . . the power of darkness," ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους (Luke xxii. 40, 46, 53).

danger confronted them in its expected forms, that we measure the warning given us by their example, which is that no arm or heart of flesh is to be trusted in the battles of the soul.

12. With their frailty there was at least a touching consciousness of it.

Though far from wealthy, when the danger of riches was announced they felt the peril within their own hearts, and asked, "Who then can be saved?" Again they appealed to Him, "Lord, increase our faith" (Matt. xix. 25; Luke xvii. 5). The exaggeration of their "cowardice" by pulpit rhetoric is scarcely less flagrant than that of their "self-confidence" at the Last Supper. Yet the conscious superiority with which we read their protests that they never would forsake their Lord should at least be mitigated by the recollection that they had just looked one upon another in fear, had shown an artless and amiable ignorance of the real traitor, and had asked, in words of which the very order betrays their breathless eagerness, "Is it I, Lord?"¹ (Matt. xxvi. 22.) Their contradiction of His warning is presumptuous; but let us at least remember that it is the presumption of hearts reassured after an intolerable dread, and after the bitterly humiliating sense that something treacherous might be detected in them every one; of hearts moreover glowing with loyalty to One who had few friends left, who had just washed their feet, and who was pouring out for them at that wondrous feast a flood of tender, sympathising affection such as never was known before.

Is there any narrative in the world, historical or dramatic, of the same bulk, in which a greater number of minute touches, which concern the minor characters and not the central figure, will bear comparison as well? But these are not collected from one narrative, they are from four

¹ Contrast the cold and formal interrogation wrung at last from Judas, "Rabbi, is it I?" (ver. 25.)

pamphlets; not the production of literary artists, but of Galileans of the first century, working moreover in the harsh material of a language not their own. They have not to do with the idiosyncracies of one individual or another (these have yet to be added to the demonstration), but with the behaviour of a group of peasants, natural, generous, affectionate, willing in spirit yet weak in flesh, dull in their unconsciousness of the wondrous plan which they are helping to develop. The miraculous incidents agree in character with those which scepticism permits us to believe, and the story in the fourth Gospel teems with resemblances to the other three. Above all, there is no trace whatever of the glorifying influence of legend or myth. No sunny haze of sanctified imagination has at once magnified and obscured their figures; no blending of romantic fancy with tender memory has wrapped them in a silvery mist of beauty, effacing the vulgar tints of earth, and revealing only a pearl-white outline, beautiful but dreamlike. It is only by the interposition of such a medium that men would fain explain away the marvellous Jesus, standing luminous in the midst of them. But all around is solid, matter-of-fact, visible in the light of day. What is written about the Apostles authenticates what we read of Christ.

G. A. CHADWICK.

“CROWNED WITH GLORY AND HONOUR.”

(HEB. II. 9.)

PROFESSOR BRUCE’S able and interesting exposition of this difficult passage deserves the most respectful consideration. His view is that Christ was crowned by the Father with glory and honour in His earthly life. This honour and glory was just in a word His position as one appointed to die in behalf of others. For God to appoint “Him to an office in which He will have an opportunity of doing a signal service to men at a great cost of suffering to Himself” is to crown Him with glory and honour, and to confer a “grace” upon Him, as it is said, “That by the grace of God (to Him) He might taste of death for every man.” I am taken to task because in a footnote I made the offhand remark that this theory “contained a fine modern idea, but one to which Scripture has hardly yet advanced,” and that “Scripture did not seem to have permitted to itself the paradox of calling Christ’s death a ‘glory.’”

Is the above “fine idea” anywhere found in Scripture? The question has some exegetical interest.

I. Certainly one’s first feeling is, that the idea that Christ’s appointment to die for men was a glory and honour conferred on Him and a grace bestowed on Him is an idea altogether out of harmony with the general tone of Scripture when referring to His sufferings and death. The tone of Scripture is represented by St. Paul (Phil. ii. 6), “Being in the form of God, He emptied Himself, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man He humbled Himself, becoming obedient *even* unto death, yea, the death of the cross” (R.V.). And to this give all the Scriptures witness. This theory speaks of Christ’s appointment to die for men as a glory and grace

conferred on Him; Scripture says, "God spared not His Son." The present epistle speaks of His enduring the cross, despising the "shame"; this theory speaks of God conferring glory upon Him by giving Him an "opportunity" of undergoing the shame. If this is not a "modern" idea, one would like to be told where to look for one. There is a multitude of passages which speak of the "grace of God" to us in appointing His Son to die, let one unequivocal one be produced which speaks of His "grace" to Christ in giving Him such an appointment. He was made a "curse" for us, being hanged upon a gibbet.

II. A number of passages however are cited, which are said to be "kindred in idea." The relevancy of these passages is not quite apparent.

"Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake." Surely their blessedness did not lie in being persecuted (which the analogy seems to require), nor were they yet in possession of their blessedness when persecuted, for blessedness here is not a state of mind. The whole sentence must be read: "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," a kingdom yet "to come." The sense of such passages is best seen from one of an opposite tendency: "Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep."

Again, the fact is referred to that Christ conjoins His glorification with His passion. There may be danger of missing the full meaning of these profound references. It would not occur however to a plain reader that Christ's glory lay in His passion, nor that He yet had His glory (for which He prays) when undergoing His passion. The corn of wheat, to use His own symbol, is not glorious in its death, but only when through death it rises up a new full corn in the ear. But as this glory will certainly be the issue of its death, so Christ's glory arises with certainty out of His dying; and therefore on the eve of His passion He

can say, "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified." The term "glorify" may in some passages be used proleptically, but other passages explain the meaning.

Further, Philippians i. 29 is adduced as in point: "Unto you it is given as a favour, in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for His sake." Such is the dignity of Christ and such are the things He has done for us, that it is a grace or privilege to us to be permitted even to suffer for His sake, as the early disciples rejoiced that they "were counted worthy to suffer dishonour for His name" (Acts v. 41), and as Moses counted His reproach greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. But it would be strange oblivion of the tone of Scripture to attempt to turn such passages round, and infer that it will in like manner be a "grace" to Christ to permit or appoint Him to suffer for *us*. To throw Christ into the scale along with other moral beings, and to pass a general moral judgment on His giving Himself to death as the act of a moral being among other moral beings, no respect being had to His Person, is to take a position "to which Scripture has hardly yet advanced."

The passage 2 Peter i. 16 certainly contains the expression "honour and glory." To a plain reader ver. 17 seems to say that God bestowed honour and glory (a common phrase) on Christ by proclaiming with a voice from heaven, "This is My beloved Son." This acknowledgment of His relation to Him was a glory. The apostle says also that he was an eyewitness of His majesty, referring to the transfiguration. It may be uncertain whether he regarded the transfiguration as a momentary manifestation of Christ's inherent glory as Son of God (John i. 14), or as a prelude of His glory as now exalted. The former is perhaps more natural, but either sense suits the connexion, which refers to the second coming, "the power and parousia" of Christ. The "honour and glory" spoken of by the apostle here belongs in his mind

to the same category as "majesty," and he refers to it to sustain the expectation of the *power* of Christ's appearing; but what connexion has such honour and glory with that supposed to be conferred by God on Christ in appointing "Him to an office in which He will have an opportunity," etc.?

These are the passages that are cited to show "that the crowning (as this theory conceives it) is an idea familiar to the New Testament writers." They do not appear to go very far in that direction.

III. Dr. Bruce's eminence in New Testament exegesis is so well known, that one can differ from him only with great hesitation. His exposition however of *βραχύ τι*, which when said of mankind he understands of "degree," and when said of Christ of "degree" and "time," cannot by any stretch of courtesy be called simple or perspicuous. For my part, I cannot conceive a writer in one place saying of men that "through fear of death they were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (ii. 15), and in another place saying of them that they are "made a little (in degree) lower than the angels," and therefore I have no doubt that the apostle used the phrase "a little" always in the temporal sense. More important however is the following point. It cannot be denied that the apostle refers to two conditions of mankind—their present condition, and their future one, when over the world to come; and to two conditions of Christ—His earthly life, and His state of exaltation; and that he draws a parallel between the two pairs, the parts of which correspond to one another, because it was necessary for Christ to go through the life and destiny of man along its whole line, to enable man to reach that which was destined for him. Now it is certain that "crowned with glory and honour," when spoken of mankind, refers to their future place in the world to come; but according to this theory, when spoken of Christ it refers to

His life in this world. There is no parallel between Him and us; what is predicated of us in our condition of perfection is predicated of Him in His condition of abasement. It is no answer to this to say that the "glory and honour" of Christ on earth is of course prolonged into His exalted state and intensified. The point is, that by bringing His "glory" forward into His earthly life, the parallel between it and our earthly life is dissolved. There is no longer a parallel, but a contrast.

IV. The distinction between the scriptural conception and the conception of this theory is quite plain. The Scripture writers fasten their attention on the plain historical facts connected with Christ as these appeared in their natural meaning to the ordinary judgment of men—on His exalted dignity from which He descended, on His abasement, the contradiction of sinners, the pains of death. This was in their view "shame," "weakness," a "humbling" of Himself. With the realistic concrete judgment natural to them they consider all this the deepest abasement, and they set it in sharp contrast to the "glory" to which He was exalted, which they conceive in a manner equally realistic. In neither case is their language in the least figurative, but always literal. It would have seemed to them an absurdity to call Christ's humiliation a "glory," when in the natural judgment of all men it was a "shame." The "glory" was the reward that followed it, "*because of the suffering of death, crowned with glory,*" "*wherefore also God has greatly exalted Him.*" To them as well as to their adversaries the cross was an ignominy and a "scandal," and they obviated the feeling, not by the ingenious suggestion that the shame was in another view a "glory," but by showing that the prophets had foretold it, and that the counsel of God had accomplished it, and that the temporary shame was swallowed up in the real glory of Christ exalted, a glory in which He would speedily reappear to the eyes

of the world. They, as well as the modern mind, pass a moral verdict on Christ's act, or, rather, on Christ Himself, but they do not use the word "glory" in regard to it. They say, "Worthy is the Lamb!" and He is worthy because that to which He subjected Himself was and remained "shame."

This modern theory moves on different lines. Its origin is probably this. First, a moral judgment is passed on Christ's act in giving Himself for others, and expressed in figurative language. In the ethical sphere, in the judgment of all moral beings, His act (to use figurative language) was a thing most glorious. Then the fact is reflected upon that it was God who put Him in the place where He performed this act; and the inference is drawn that God crowned Him with glory by appointing "Him to an office in which He will have an opportunity of doing a signal service to men at a great cost of suffering to Himself"; *i.e.* an act which (figuratively) is so glorious. Is there any evidence that any Scripture writer ever pursued this peculiar line of reflection? The reflection is suggested at once to the modern mind by the figurative language in which it expresses its moral verdict on Christ's act in our redemption.

That this is the line of thought that led to the curious speculation appears from the formula enunciated by Dr. Bruce, that "exalted because of" implies "exalted in." The formula is a mere heap of heterogeneous words. "Exalted in" belongs to the sphere of moral judgment, or moral worth, and modern figurative language; "exalted because of" belongs to the sphere of historical events and Scripture literal language. If Scripture language be adhered to, the formula is so far from being true, that it is the opposite of the truth—He humbled Himself, wherefore also God greatly exalted Him. Is there any evidence that any Scripture writer ever used the words "glory" or "exalted" of Christ in His act of giving His life for men, or that any

Scripture writer ever expressed his own sense of the moral worthiness of this act by such terms as "glorious" or "exalted" ?

The only question that could arise is, whether the writer to the Hebrews agrees in his phraseology with the other writers. There is no reason to suppose that he differs. When he says of Christ that "He hath been counted worthy of more glory than Moses" (iii. 3), he refers to His glory in heaven. So (I believe) he does when he says that "He glorified not Himself to be made a high priest" (v. 5). He does not speak of the high-priestly office in the abstract, nor as exercised on earth ; he speaks of it under the complexion which it has as exercised in heaven. In other words, he agrees with all the New Testament writers in regarding Christ's Messianic office (or, high priesthood) as beginning to be exercised in its proper and full sense only on His ascension (Acts ii. 36). But even if the second passage referred to the office in itself, that would be far from implying that the apostle was thinking of the office as it involved death, for the office of Aaron, with whom comparison is made in the passage, did not involve death.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE HALLEL.

(Pss. CXIII.-CXVIII.)

THE Psalms of the Hallel have a special interest from the fact that they were sung by the Jewish Church at her three great Feasts, and may thus be taken as representing her inmost thought in those hours in which she held closest communion with her God. But to us they have a still deeper solemnity, from the fact that they were sung by our Lord with His disciples at the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 27).

It is from these two points of view that I propose to regard them: first, as the words of Israel; secondly, as the words of Christ. These two points of view are indeed closely connected. God says of Israel (Exod. iv. 22), "Israel is My son, My first-born." It is true that in Isaiah Israel is called "the servant of the Lord" (xli. 8, xlii. 1, etc.), but the Septuagint never allows us to forget that the "servant" (עֶבֶד) is a "son" (παῖς, cf. xlii. 1 with Matt. xii. 18 ff; see also Acts iv. 27, 30, where St. Peter and St. John apply this word to Christ).

Israel is God's son, inasmuch as he manifests God's name to the world (Isa. xlix. 3-6). He has thus a relation, not only of elder brother to the Gentiles, but also to all nature, to the whole creation. He is not only a "first-born among many brethren," but also "a first-born of all creation" (Col. i. 15).

These two thoughts may be taken as representing God's ideal for Israel, an ideal which was ever with Him in the Person of His Son, and which in the fulness of time blossomed on earth in the Person of Christ. These two thoughts, the ingathering of the Gentiles, and the uplifting¹ of all nature into "the liberty of the glory of the children of God," were the central thoughts in Israel's three great Feasts.

We speak of the *three* Feasts, but it is necessary to bear in mind that in Leviticus xxiii. the Feasts are not *three*, but *seven*. This chapter should be carefully studied by all who would understand the Hallel.

The following Table will be seen to represent the Jewish Feasts as given in Leviticus xxiii.:

¹ Rom. viii. 21. Compare the thought of the *heave-offering* and the *wave-offering*.

ORDER OF FEASTS IN LEVITICUS XXIII. (4-END).

Spring Feasts (Life from Life.)	(i.) 1st Month, 14th day (even.)	PASSOVER	Birthday of the First-born.	Correspond with the <i>First Part</i> of the Hallel, viz. Pss. cxiii., cxiv., which were sung over the 2nd cup at the Passover, and therefore <i>before</i> the institution of the Eucharist.
	(ii.) " 15th-21st	FEAST OF CAKES	The First-born transforms and uplifts nature unto God.	
	(iii.) Beginning of Harvest	WAVE SHEAF		
	(iv.) End of Harvest (<i>i.e.</i> 50 days later)	WAVE LOAVES		
Autumn Feasts (Life from Death.)	(v.) 7th Month, 1st day	TRUMPETS	A Memorial of Judgment on heathen gods.	Correspond with the <i>Second Part</i> of the Hallel, viz. Pss. cxv.-cxviii., which were sung over the 4th and last cup at the Passover, and therefore <i>after</i> the institution of the Eucharist.
	(vi.) " 10th day	ATONEMENT	Accepted suffering.	
	(vii.) " 15th-21st	TABERNACLES	The Fruits of Victory.	

I would call special attention to the fact that the Jewish Passover ritual divided the Hallel into two Parts, Part I. (Pss. cxiii., cxiv.), Part II. (Pss. cxv.-cxviii.); and that these two Parts answer exactly to the Spring and Autumn Feasts respectively. We might take as a motto for the first part, "Because I live ye shall live also," and for the second, "A corn of wheat is not quickened except it die." The reader will remember that Feasts i., ii., and iii. were embraced under the common name of the Passover, while the Feasts of the Seventh Month all led up to the great Feast of Tabernacles. The Seventh Month is the month of *New Year*, and even in the early Babylonian religion it commenced with a Feast of Judgment (*Cf. Sayce, Hibbert Lectures*, p. 94). The fact that the Jewish year began in the seventh Month would justify us in reading the second part of the Hallel first; we should then see more clearly the Christian meaning of Part I.

The connexion of the Psalms of the Hallel with the Feasts will best be seen by reading them in their entirety ; for this purpose I offer the following translation, merely giving such notes as are necessary to draw out the leading thought of each Psalm in its connexion with the corresponding Feast in the above Table.

The most holy Name I have represented by the symbol $\dot{A}\dot{A}$ which gives the sound of the Hebrew אֶהְיֶה, "I AM." I have not space to give my reasons¹ for using this symbol ; suffice it to say, that I regard the modern *Jahve* as a complete mistake, while every scholar feels that the word *Lord* falls very short of the Hebrew יְהוָה.

HALLEL, PART I. (PSS. CXIII., CXIV.), AS SUNG BY THE JEWS
OVER THE SECOND CUP.

(Cf. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi. 27.)

Ps. CXIII.

Zion's *Magnificat*, or Zion's mother-joy on the birth of her Gentile children. This Psalm corresponds with the *Passover* (see Table), and is full of the thought of the First-born. An Easter Psalm.

- | | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| | 1 | Praise ye Yah ! |
| | | Praise, O ye servants of $\dot{A}\dot{A}$, |
| | | Praise ye the Name ² of $\dot{A}\dot{A}$. |
| in Time. | { | 2 May the Name of $\dot{A}\dot{A}$ be blessed |
| | | From henceforth for ever and ever. |
| in Space. | { | 3 From the rising of the sun to his setting |
| | | May the Name of $\dot{A}\dot{A}$ be praised. |
| | 4 | High is $\dot{A}\dot{A}$ o'er all Nations ! |
| | | His Glory above the heavens ! |
| | 5 | Who is as $\dot{A}\dot{A}$ our God ? |
| | | That mounteth so high to be throned ! |

¹ I have fully discussed this question in my *Names of God and in Akkadian Genesis*. (Deighton & Co., Cambridge.)

² I.e. the manifestation.

The Incarna- 6 That sinketh so low to be seen !

tion.

In the Heavens !

In the Earth !

Cf. *Magni-
ficat.*

7 That raiseth the weak from the dust,
That uplifteth the poor from the dunghill,

8 To throne them along with princes,
E'en with His princely People !

9 That throneth the barren one¹ in the home,
As a joyous Mother of children.

Praise ye Yah !

Note.—Ver. 3. The thought is identical with that of Mal. i. 11 : “ For from the rising of the sun to his setting great is My Name among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to My Name, and a pure offering.” Must not this prophecy have been in our Lord’s mind as He sang this birthday Psalm of “ a people that should be born ” from His own sufferings ? Cf. Isa. xlix. 5, 6.

Note.—Vers. 7–9. These verses I would call Christ’s *Magnificat*. In a certain sense they apply to Israel in so far as Israel is God’s son (*παῖς*), who by his sufferings brings the Gentile-world to its birth. Thus according to Isa. liv. 1–5, the Jewish Church is herself “ the Barren one,” until in pain she brings forth the Gentiles as her first-born. “ Sing, O Barren one that hast not borne ; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that hast not travailed : for more are the children of the desolate one than the children of the married one, saith the Lord, etc. : . . . the God of the whole earth He shall be called.” The entire passage should be read and compared with St. Paul’s argument in Gal. iv. 26 ff. “ Life from life ” is the leading thought of the Spring Feasts, and this means life from pain.

Ps. cxiv.

As the previous Psalm gave the birth-pangs of a new People, so this gives the birth-pangs of a new Creation, and thus answers exactly to Feasts ii., iii., and iv. (see Table). When of old God’s People came out of Egypt (a Paschal thought), His *holiness* was represented by Judah, which led the van (Num. ii. 3, 9), His *strength* by Israel. Even then all nature was moved (vers. 3–7) ; how much more when God Himself comes in His own Person (vers. 7, 8) ? Cf. Hab. iii.

1 When Israel came forth from Egypt,
The House of Jacob from among the Barbarians,

2 His (*i.e.* God’s) holiness then was Judah,
His power was shown in Israel.

¹ Cf. Isa. liv. with Gal. iv. 27.

- 3 The sea saw—then it fled !
 Jordan rolled himself back !
- 4 The mountains skipped like rams,
 The hills like the young of the flock !
- 5 What ailed thee, O sea, that thou fleddest ?
 Thou Jordan, that thou shouldst roll back ?
- 6 Ye mountains, why skip ye like rams ?
 Ye hills, like the young of the flock ?
- How much 7 At the presence of ÅÅ travail, thou Earth !
 more
 when God At the presence of Jacob's God,
 comes in 8 Who turneth the rock into pools,
 Person? The flint into fountains of water !

Note.—Both this Psalm and the preceding one are appointed by the Church for Easter Day. The LXX. in ver. 1 read *ἐν ἐξόδῳ Ἰσραήλ*. . . . Cf. Luke ix. 31, *τὴν ἐξοδὸν αὐτοῦ*, "His departure (R.V. margin), which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem" (Neale).

The question in vers. 5 and 6 is not answered. The thought is as follows ; If at the first Exodus (Passover), when God was revealed only in the Pillar and Cloud, all nature was moved, how much more when at the second Exodus (Passover) God Himself leads His people in person as He promised (Mic. ii. 13)!

In the preceding Psalm we saw the Presence (and therefore the sufferings) of the Son of God as giving birth to the Nations ; so in this Psalm we see that same Presence uplifting Nature. This latter thought was symbolized by the *Wave sheaf* of Passover and the *Wave loaves* of Pentecost (see Table). I therefore conclude that these two Psalms, which compose the first part of the Hallel, were written with special reference to the Spring Feasts.

HALLEL, PART II. (PSS. CXV.—CXVIII.), AS SUNG BY THE JEWS OVER THE FOURTH CUP.

(Cf. *ὑμνήσαντες*, Matt. xxvi. 30), answering to the Feasts
 of the Seventh Month, which all speak of death.¹

Ps. cxv.

The connexion of this Psalm with the Feast of Trumpets is not obvious at first sight ; a word of explanation must therefore be given. An inscription of Nebuchadnezzar (quoted by Sayce, *Hib. Lect.*, p. 94)

¹ The connexion between the seventh month and the Sabbath of death was far older even than the times of Abraham, as I have shown in my *Akkadian Genesis*.

tells us that "on the Great Festival at the beginning of the year (*i.e.* in the seventh month), on the eighth and eleventh days of the month, the divine king the god of heaven and earth, the lord of heaven, descends, while the gods in heaven and earth, listening to him with reverential awe, and standing humbly before him, determine therein a destiny of long-ending days." This thought finds its counterpart in the Psalms, *e.g.* Ps. lxxxii. 1, "God hath taken His place in the assembly of the mighty ones (אל), Amongst the gods (אלהים) He is judging." I may have occasion to speak of this Psalm in a future paper; meanwhile I would remark that the blowing of Trumpets on "New Year" was as it were an appeal to Israel's God to take His place in Judgment on the gods of the heathen. Compare the taking of Jericho, also Numbers x. 9, "Ye shall blow an alarm with the trumpets, and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and shall be saved from your enemies." The "Day of Trumpets" or the day of "The Memorial of the Trumpet" (זְכֹרֶתן תְּרוּעָה) was to Israel what the "Bow in the Cloud" was to Noah, it was the outward visible sign of Mercy and Truth meeting together in Redemption; therefore in Ps. lxxxix. 14, 15, we read, "Righteousness and justice are the base of Thy throne, Mercy and Truth go before Thy face. Happy is the people that know the Trumpet-sound (תְּרוּעָה)." So in our present Psalm the "memorial" goes up to God "because of Thy mercy, because of Thy truth" (ver. 1). God answers this appeal (vers. 12-15), with plenteous Redemption. The Psalm may be translated as follows:

1 Not for our sake, Å Å, not for our sake,
 But for the sake of Thy Name grant glory,
 Mercy and Truth meet. Because of Thy Mercy, because of Thy Truth.

2 Wherefore should the heathen say,
 "Where now is their God?"

Ps. cxxxv. 6. 3 Yet our God is in Heaven;
 All that He willeth is done.

Ps. cxxxv. 4 Their idols are silver and gold,
 15-20. The work of the hands of man:

5 A mouth they have, but cannot speak;
 Eyes they have, but cannot see;

6 Ears they have, but cannot hear;
 - A nose they have, but cannot smell;

7 Hands, yet cannot feel;

- Feet, yet cannot walk;
 Nor can they utter from their throat.
 8 They that make them shall become as they,
 Even every one that putteth his trust in them.
 9 O Israel, trust in $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$:
 He is their help and their shield.
 10 O house of Aaron, trust in $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$:
 He is their help and their shield.
 11 Ye fearers of $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$, trust in $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$:
 He is their help and their shield.
 God has ful-12 $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$ has become mindful of us. He will bless,
 filled the
 promise of
 Num. x. 9. He will bless the house of Israel,
 He will bless the house of Aaron,
 13 He will bless the fearers of $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$,
 The least along with the greatest.
 14 May $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$ add unto you,
 Unto you and unto your children.¹
 15 Blessed be ye of $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$,
 The Maker of heaven and earth.²
 16 The heavens are the heavens of $\ddot{A}\ddot{A}$,
 And the earth He gave for the children of men.
 17 It is not the dead that praise Yah,
 Not they all that go down into silence,
 18 But we,—we will praise Yah,
 From henceforth, for ever and ever.
 Praise ye Yah!

Note.—The Day of Trumpets is the pledge of the final Day of Atonement. Israel sounds with the Trumpet, and God is "mindful" of him, and deliver him (cf. Ps. xlvii. 6); but Zechariah says that, in the time to come, "the Lord God shall sound with the Trumpet" (Zech. ix. 14). The Jews themselves have interpreted this to signify that the former deliverances were not final, but that in the days of the Messiah "I am going to redeem you by Myself, and then shall ye never more be brought in bondage." (See the whole context in my translation of the *Yalkut* on Zechariah, pp. 53, 54.) "On New Year men are redeemed from the Angel of death" (*Yalkut*, l.c.); this explains vers. 17 and

¹ Cf. Deut. i. 11, Moses' blessing.

² Cf. Gen. xiv. 19, Melchizedek's blessing.

18 of our Psalm. According to a Jewish tradition, the Hallel was not used on the Day of Atonement, because of the deep solemnity of the day; neither was it used on the Feast of Trumpets, because then "the King sits upon His throne, and the books of Life and the books of Death are opened" (Mishna, *Rosh Hashana*, vii. 4). Be this as it may, the thoughts of the Feast of Trumpets and of the Day of Atonement are certainly represented in the Psalms of the Hallel.

Ps. cxvi. (cf. *Day of Atonement* in Table).

Israel, though a son, learns obedience (i.e. *love*, ver. 1, and *faith*, ver. 10) by the things that he suffers. The very darkness is only background for the rainbow. Cf. Heb. v. 7.

- 1 I love—for ÅÅ hears
My supplicating voice,
- 2 For to me He hath lent an ear;
So I call (to Him) all my days.
- 3 Pangs of Death enveloped me,
Straits¹ of Hell gat hold upon me:
- 4 Anguish and grief (alone) I find.
Then I call on the Name of ÅÅ,
"Oh now, ÅÅ, deliver my soul."

[Cf. "O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from Me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt" (Matt. xxvi. 39).]

- 5 Gracious is ÅÅ, and Righteous:
Yea, our God is Merciful.
- 6 ÅÅ is the Guardian of simple folk:
I am weak, but He is mine to save me.
- 7 Return, O my soul, to thy haven of rest;
For ÅÅ hath wrought kindness upon thee.
- 8 For Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine
eyes from tears, my feet from falling.
- 9 I shall walk before ÅÅ in the Lands² of the Living.

(N.B.—According to the Sept. the Psalm ends here, a new Psalm commencing at ver. 10. There is indeed a very real division of thought, ver. 10 answering exactly to ver. 1. See Notes.)

¹ This word occurs again in Ps. cxviii. 5; elsewhere it is only found in Lam. i. 3. ² The plural reminds us of the "many mansions."

- 10 I believe—for I can say,
 " As for me, I was greatly afflicted ;
 11 As for me, I thought in my panic,
 ' All man's estate is a lie.' "

- 12 What return can I make to *ĀĀ*
 For all His kindness He hath wrought ¹ upon me?
 13 The Cup of Salvations ² I lift,
 And I call on the Name of ĀĀ.
 14 *My vows to ĀĀ I can pay,*
 In the presence of all His people.

[Cf. " O My Father, if this cannot pass away, except I
 drink it, Thy will be done " (Matt. xxvi. 42).]

- 15 Right dear in the sight of *ĀĀ* is the death of His
 saints,
 16 Oh now *ĀĀ* ! surely I am Thy Servant,
 I am Thy Servant, the son of Thine handmaid ;
 Thou hast undone my fetters.
 17 The sacrifice of thanksgiving I sacrifice to Thee,
 And I call on the Name of ĀĀ.
 18 *My vows to ĀĀ I can pay,*
 In the presence of all His people ;

[Cf. " A third time, saying the same words " (Matt.
 xxvi. 44).]

- 19 In the Courts of the House of *ĀĀ*,
 In the midst of thee, O Jerusalem.
 Praise ye Yah !

Note.—Ver. 1. Whether these words be the words of Israel or of Christ, the
love is founded upon the Rock of an inner experience which no terrors of death
 or desertion can shake. " Father, I thank Thee that Thou heardest Me. And
 I knew that Thou hearest Me always " (St. John xi. 41, 42, R.V.). " Having
 loved His own which were in the world, He loved them to the uttermost "

¹ Cf. ver. 7.

² *I.e.* the final Salvation, which includes all others.

(St. John xiii. 1, R.V., marg.). This verse of the Psalm should be carefully compared with the 10th verse; see below.

Note.—The three times repeated refrain (vers. 4, 13, 17) proves the Psalm to be a whole. The three “cries” may be compared with the thrice repeated cry of Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 39–44). The first is the saddest, as in the Gospel.

It is impossible to read vers. 3 and 4 of our Psalm without being reminded of Him “who in the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him out of death, and having been heard for His godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered” (Heb. v. 7, 8). The two last “cries” (vers. 13, 17) come *after* the full acceptance of “the Cup of Salvations” (ver. 13); the reader will observe that the refrain has now become a joy, just as the prayer does in Gethsemane.

But though the Psalm is a whole, the break before ver. 10 is most important to be observed. The words “I believe” (ver. 10) exactly answer to “I love” (ver. 1). The tenses would, in Greek, have been *perfects*. In both cases the *love* and the *faith* are the very outcome of the suffering; compare St. Paul’s quotation of ver. 10 in 2 Cor. iv. 13 with context.

If, as I believe, the whole Psalm was written for the Day of Atonement, we might well suppose Part I. (*i.e.* vers. 1–9) to have been sung before the High Priest entered the Holy of Holies, and Part II. (*i.e.* vers. 10 to end) to have welcomed his reappearance “apart from sin, unto salvation” (Heb. ix. 28).

Ps. cxvii.

A prophecy of the conversion of the Gentiles in the times of the Messiah. So Kimchi and St. Paul (Rom. xv. 9–11). See Neale’s Commentary. The birth of the Gentiles results from the “pangs of Messiah.” This Psalm is to the Autumn Feasts what Ps. cxiii. is to the Spring Feasts.

- 1 Praise ÄÄ, all ye Gentiles;
Extol Him, all ye Peoples.
 - 2 For His Mercy hath prevailed over us;
And the Truth of ÄÄ is eternal.
- Praise ye Yah!

Note.—Ver. 2. Neale well quotes Gen. vii. 18–20, where the same word is twice used of the waters of the Flood *prevailing*. So now there shall be a flood of Mercy.

The Gentiles who were “once far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ” (Eph. ii. 13, see context).

Ps. cxviii.

A Psalm of Tabernacles (see Table). The suffering Son of God is victorious over Death and Hell, and enters on the Fruits of Victory, being acknowledged as King by all Creation. An Easter Psalm.

Chorus.	{	1 Give thanks unto ÅÅ ; for (He) is good ; for His mercy is eternal,
		2 Let now Israel say, "for His mercy is eternal."
		3 Let now the House of Aaron say, "for His mercy is eternal."
		4 Let the fearers of ÅÅ say, "for His mercy is eternal."

The Son (Israel, Christ) speaks.	5 In straits I called upon Yah, In largeness Yah gave me His answer.
	6 ÅÅ is mine ; I will not fear : What can man do unto me ?
	7 ÅÅ is mine ! among my helpers ! Then as for me I'll look upon my foes.

Chorus.	{	8 Better it is to shelter in ÅÅ Than to put confidence in man.
		9 Better it is to shelter in ÅÅ Than to put confidence in princes.

The Son (Israel, Christ) speaks.	10 All nations encompassed me round, 'Tis in ÅÅ's Name that I foil ¹ them.
	11 They compassed, yea, compassed me round : 'Tis in ÅÅ's name that I foil ¹ them.
	12 They compassed me round like plagues, ¹ They flared like a fire of thorns : 'Tis in ÅÅ's name that I foil them.
	13 Thou didst thrust me well nigh unto falling : But ÅÅ hath helped me.

¹ Reading uncertain.

14 My strength and my song is Yah ;
And He hath become my Salvation.

Chorus. { 15 A shout of joy and Salvation
Rings through the tents of the righteous :
The right hand of ÅÅ hath wrought might !
16 The right hand of ÅÅ hath been raised !
The right hand of ÅÅ hath wrought might !

The Son (Israel, Christ) speaks. 17 I shall not die, but shall live,
And shall tell out the works of Yah.
18 Yah did indeed chasten me sore :
But not unto death did He give me.
19 Open for me the gates of Righteousness : ¹
I will enter by them, I will give thanks to Yah.

Chorus. { 20 This is the Gate—that belongs to ÅÅ ;
The righteous may enter thereby.

The Son (Israel, Christ) speaks. 21 I thank Thee, for that Thou hast heard me,
And hast become mine for salvation.

Chorus. { 22 A stone that the builders rejected
Hath become the chief-stone of the corner !
23 From ÅÅ (Himself) hath this come to pass ;
And it is wondrous in our eyes.
24 This is the Day that ÅÅ hath made ;
Let us joy and rejoice therein.
25 *Ana,*² ÅÅ, *Hoshiana,*
Ana, ÅÅ, *Hatzlichana.*
26 Blessed is the Coming One in the Name of ÅÅ :
We bless you from out of the House of ÅÅ.
27 ÅÅ is God, and gives us light,
Proclaim ³ the Feast with the Branches,
Even up to the horns of the Altar.

¹ In late Hebrew פָּדָה is used almost in the sense of "victory."

² A mystical name of God, the origin of which I have shown in my *Akkadian Genesis*.

³ Vulg. "Constituere diem solemnem."

The Son (Israel, Christ) speaks. { 28 My God (*El*), Thou art, and I thank Thee :
My God (*Elohim*), I extol Thee.

Chorus. 29 Give thanks unto *ĀĀ*; for (He) is good: for His mercy is eternal.

Note.—Ver. 12. The present text reads דְּבָרִים, “bees”; for which I suggest דְּבָרִים, as in Hos. xiii. 14, “I will be thy plagues, O Death.”

In the plague-legends of Chaldea, *Deber*, “the plague,” is often personified, and is usually connected with “the Burner.” There are traces of this thought in the Old Testament, e.g. Hab. iii. 5, “Before Him went the plague (*Deber*), and the Burner (*רשף*) went forth at His feet” (see Versions). In our present Psalm the contest has been, not with bees, but with Death. It is indeed the fulfilment of Hosea xiii. 14.

Note.—Ver. 20. This verse is, I think, best explained by Ezek. xlv. 1–4. “And he brought me back toward the gate of the Sanctuary outside, which faces east; and it was shut. And *ĀĀ* said unto me, This gate shall be shut, not opened, and none shall enter by it, because *ĀĀ*, the God of Israel, hath entered by it: and thus it hath become closed. The Prince however, inasmuch as he is a Prince [and therefore a type of Messiah], he shall sit therein to eat bread before *ĀĀ*.” Compare also xlv. 1–3 and xliii. 4. This Gate is “the new and living way” (Heb. x. 19). But after Messiah (the Prince) has entered thereby He can say, “Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth may enter in” (Isa. xxvi. 2).

Notes.—This Psalm is generally admitted to have been written for the Feast of Tabernacles. That great feast gathered in all the thoughts of the great Sabbath-month. The seventh month (Autumnal Equinox) spoke, even to the Babylonians, of the death and resurrection of the year. The branches (cf. ver. 27) carried at this Feast were a memorial of the fruits of the earth, and especially the vintage, now gathered in. These branches were chosen from water-loving trees. Thus, in the *Order of the Hosannah Rabba*, the Jews still pray,

“Answer those that cry with the four water trees.”

(תענה שואלים ברבוע אשלי מים)

I.e. the Palm, Citron, Myrtle, and Willow.

The reason for this choice was, I think, because one of the leading thoughts of the Feast was Prayer for Rain, upon which the fruits of the opening year depended. But the tree which represented the mystical Israel was especially “the Vine of David.” The earliest passage is Isa. v. 1: “Love (*רוֹדִי*) had a vineyard,” etc., where Vulgate reads *vinca*. Again, Ps. lxxx. (lxxix.) 8 ff “Thou didst bring a Vine out of Egypt. . . . The mountains were covered with its shadow. . . . Look from heaven, behold, and visit this Vine, and the Branch that Thy right hand hath planted and the Scion (*בֵּן*) which Thou hast made strong for Thyself.” Here again the Vulgate uses *vinca* for נֶפֶץ just as for פֶּרֶם in Isa. v. 1. In the *Order of the Hosannahs* the following passage occurs, which clearly proves that Isa. v. 1 ff was regarded as a mystical allusion to the Vine of David. “As Thou didst save the Wine-press of Thy hewing.

(יָקֵב מִחֲצִנִּיךְ, cf. יָקֵב חֲצֵב, Isa. v. 2), so now save us who encompass (the altar) with green branches singing, *Ana Va Ho Hoshiana*" (cf. v. 25). The transference of this thought to the Eucharist may be seen in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, chap. ix. (see Taylor's edition, p. 68 ff). "And as touching the Eucharist, thus give ye thanks. First, concerning the cup: We thank Thee, O our Father, for Thy holy vine of David Thy child, which Thou hast made known to us in Thy Child (παῖς) Jesus. . . ."

The Psalms of the Hallel thus gather into one Thanksgiving all the thoughts of all the whole year's Feasts, a fitting Service for that great night when all was fulfilled in the one "Pure Offering" "for the life of the world."

It may be interesting to observe that, of the Hallel Psalms, our Church appoints Psalms cxiii., cxiv., and cxviii. for Easter Day; now Psalm cxiii. is a *Passover* Psalm, cxiv. a *Pentecost* Psalm, and cxviii. a Psalm of *Tabernacles*. Thus the "Queen of Festivals" gathers in all that was foreshadowed by the three great Jewish Feasts.

ED. G. KING.

IN SELF-DEFENCE: CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON MY HEBREW NEW TESTAMENT.

I.

THE late Isaac Salkinson, missionary of the British Society, whose Hebrew translation of the New Testament has now appeared in its second edition, and is circulated among the Jews with extraordinary zeal, was personally well known to me, was indeed an intimate friend. We became acquainted with one another in 1870, when we met at a conference of missionaries and friends of the Jewish Mission, and were at once attracted toward each other. Salkinson had then completed the translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, but had not discovered a Hebrew equivalent for the English title. He did not at that time venture upon any suggestion, but subsequently he determined to entitle his rendering, וִיגֵרַשׁ מִגֶּן־עֵדֶן, "He sent forth from the garden of Eden." In fact "*Paradise Lost*," in the sense in which it was used as the title of the English poem, could not be reproduced in Hebrew. This must have been specially

difficult for Salkinson, who would eschew the phrase נִרְעָר יֵאָבֵד as non-biblical.

In April, 1855, an attempt had already been made by Salkinson to produce a new translation of the New Testament. A specimen of such a rendering was published under the title, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans translated into Hebrew*. I gave expression to my opinion of it in my monograph of 1870, entitled, *Paulus des Apostels Brief an die Römer in das Hebräische uebersetzt und aus Talmud und Midrasch erläutert*. In that paper I heartily admitted the masterly style of this Hebraist, but took exception to his method of translation in aiming too much at a biblical elegance and classical diction, and so leading to the use of phrases that did not literally represent the text. And there too I laid down the principle that the translation should not avoid rabbinical expressions, if they supply the words and formulæ in which, without undue straining, the New Testament Greek can be made intelligible to those who employ the post-biblical literature.

My own work upon a new Hebrew translation of the New Testament had been completed and all my preparations for publication had been made as early as the year 1870, but the actual issuing of the book was delayed till the spring of 1877. During all these years I was anxiously seeking for a publisher who should undertake the responsibility of the whole work, and then at last the British and Foreign Bible Society stretched out to me its helpful hand. By this time Salkinson also had again taken up the work of translation. I doubt not that my own rendering would have gained considerably had we carried on this common work together, although after a careful survey and examination of all doubtful passages my judgment still remains unaltered. I look upon it now as quite natural that the man who had won great applause by his translations of the *Urania* of Tiedge, the *Paradise Lost* of Milton, and some

plays of Shakespeare would not be able easily to bring himself to take the place of a worker under me. I have the letter which he then wrote me, inclosing a new translation of the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, which has not before been published, although the reckless way in which this "beautiful Hebrew New Testament" has been eulogised might have tempted me to make it known. An article in the January number of the *Quarterly Record* of the Trinitarian Bible Society for 1886 quoted a Jewish opinion, according to which "the work of Delitzsch, in comparison with the work of Salkinson, is like a miserable tent compared with the palaces of kings"!

Quite another spirit was shown by Salkinson in his criticism of my work. He admitted the force and importance of the principles on which I proceeded, and claimed only recognition of the relative value of his own divergent views upon the question. The letter will be thoroughly satisfactory and conclusive with all who are really acquainted with the subject, as showing clearly the special characteristics of the two translations and affording ample materials for forming a judgment. I give it here without alteration or abridgment.

"35, REIVNER ST., LANDSTRASSE, VIENNA,
June 11th, 1877.

"MY DEAR SIR,—

"I was on the point of answering your kind letter, besides giving an explanation in anticipation of your question on the card, and waited only for the inclosed specimen, which I got just now. With regard to your query, you will remember, after your publication of the Epistle to the Romans, that I offered you my co-operation in continuing and carrying out the version; but you then informed me that you had the materials of the whole book already, which required only correction and revision. Accordingly, out of the high respect and true Christian affection which I cherish for you, I made a self-denying resolution, and determined to let you have the whole field free. When I recently saw a statement to the effect that your work is accomplished and is being published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, I was very glad for your sake and for the sake of your great work and thought. And now has my time

come to gratify my old desire. It so happened that just then a friend of the committee of the British Society proposed that I should be employed in writing a Talmudic Christology. I answered that I would prefer first to make a new Hebrew version of the New Testament. To this the committee agreed, and I now commenced my task with the epistles. My plan is to take a good share of liberty in regard to words and phrases, and to be faithful only to the sense and spirit of the text, which must neither be added to nor taken from in anything. Its principle is that of the maxim, 'The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life,' and so I hope to be able to make a tolerably pure Hebrew version. There will of course be a few exceptions, like the abstract noun לְהוֹתָא, which you find in the specimen, and other words of a like nature; but they will not affect the whole.

"You are perfectly correct in saying that when the New Testament writers wrote their Greek they had still the Hebrew of their day in mind; but then I want to translate the sense and not to use the words: and so, when I find the apostles writing ἀπὸ κρίσεως κόσμου, I render it by the idiomatic phrase יוֹסֵפִי: בְּרֹא אֶמֶן וְשָׁמַיִם. Now the apostle himself can have no objection to see his idea expressed in good old Hebrew.

"I confess to you too, that the man to whom the gospel has become the power of salvation will prefer a literal translation, just as he would prefer that a love-letter sent to him in an unknown tongue should be rendered to him *verbatim*. But we must remember that our New Testament is intended chiefly for our unconverted brethren. Therefore it may be of some service to have it in a style which the Jews have not yet forgotten to appreciate, that is, the biblical Hebrew.

"In the inclosed specimen you will see at a glance what kind of liberty I take: מְלָאכְוֹתֵיהֶם for apostleship. מְלָאכְוֹת is the literal rendering, but in the absolute state it does not occur. Hence it does not sound pretty, and I therefore added an intensive particle יָה as in שְׁלֶבֶתֶיהָ, which makes no difference in the real sense. If the reader translates מְלָאכְוֹתֵיהֶם 'Divine apostleship,' he will not err, since the apostle himself tells us that this office he got from God. In ver. 9 I added וְנִפְשִׁי to the word בְּרוּחִי, because the idiom requires that בְּרוּחִי in the construction of the verse should not stand alone. Hence the synonymous נִפְשִׁי is added, which makes no alteration in the meaning. Now all the liberties in this chapter could be avoided, but as there will be places where such liberties, and even more, will be absolutely necessary, I therefore put forward this chapter as a specimen, and would be glad to have your opinion, whether I have not overstepped the limits of the boundary.

"Now I hope, as I have sympathised and do sympathise with your work, so will you with mine, and even encourage it if possible; thus

making it manifest that we have learned of the evangelists, who each wrote the same story, not in rivalry but to serve the same common Master. I would like to say a great many things, but time forbids.

“I. E. SALKINSON.”

After Salkinson had wellnigh concluded his labours as a translator of the New Testament, and had prepared the first draught of it—only the Acts of the Apostles had not been completed—his unexpected death brought sore bereavement on his family, and put a sudden stop to the work that had been so dear to him. I hastened to express my warm sympathy for the sorrowing widow, Mrs. Henrietta Salkinson, and I made offer to her of my assistance. In reply she wrote me on June 14th, 1883, when amongst other things she said: “I do assure you that never in my dear husband’s mind was there the least desire that his work should be made a rival of yours, but he regarded this work as the task of his life. I have heard him repeatedly say, ‘God has given me talent for translating, and I must use it for His glory.’ And there are indeed in almost every language several translations of the New Testament, and so too in the Hebrew language there may surely be different translations existing alongside of one another, from which every one may choose the version that most perfectly satisfies his tastes and his needs.”

These are golden words, which I should like myself to take to heart, and shall be greatly delighted if Salkinson’s translation should obtain numerous Jewish readers, and should be the means of leading many to the conviction that Jesus Christ is Israel’s noblest son, the holiest and divinest Man and the Servant of the Lord, who has offered Himself up for His people and for the whole world of sinners; and I consider it a providential circumstance, a gracious dispensation of my God, that the new translation has appeared before my departure. I have received from it a new impulse in the revision of my own work, and I openly

acknowledge that the discovery of the imperfections of my own work has been greatly increased since the year 1885. Yet at the same time I am still thoroughly convinced of the soundness of the principle which I followed in my translation of rendering the New Testament into Hebrew of such a kind as the sacred writers would themselves have employed had they thought and written in Hebrew. There are several passages, though the number is by no means great, in which Salkinson has made in his version what we might style a more happy hit. Nevertheless continued study of the New Testament and of biblical and post-biblical Hebrew, especially of the Hebrew syntax, and the careful consideration of critical reviews which in rich abundance lie before me, have led me ever more and more to the humbling conclusion that I am still very far short of reaching the ideal of a Hebrew counterpart of the Greek New Testament.

A new reprint of the 32mo edition of my work has just now appeared. Although the edition has been electrotyped, I have been able to make various improvements in it by having some plates recast and occasional corrections made in some of the other plates. Including the octavo edition, which appeared in the year 1885, this new 32mo edition may be reckoned the ninth. The octavo edition has not been electrotyped, and it is to be followed by a tenth edition, for which Hebrew types more in accordance with the national pattern than those previously employed will be provided. It is my earnest prayer that God may preserve my life so long that I may be able to give expression to my most mature convictions in this tenth edition. It will be not merely a revision of my translation, but a new translation.

And now I shall point out a few instances to show how much still remains to be done in order to the perfect performance of the task, and only as a preliminary example I give what follows. The imperial name *Kaïσap* occurs in the New Testament no less than twenty-eight times. My

translation as well as that of Salkinson's, with two striking exceptions, in Luke iii. 5, Philippians iv. 22, renders this *Kaïσap* by הֶקָיֶסֶר. But as in the New Testament Greek this word *Kaïσap* is always found without the article, and is therefore treated as a self-determining proper name, so it would seem that the Hebrew קִיסֶר in the Talmud and Midrasch is also always employed without the article. In every case then the article should be removed. But how will this principle affect such a phrase as מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם? In the case of these two words we find that in the oldest synagogal literature שָׁמַיִם has not the article, whereas in my translation, as well as in Salkinson's, the phrase is throughout written מַלְכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם. Is the article also in this instance to be dispensed with? We shall seek to answer this question in our next paper.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

EARLY CHRISTIAN MONUMENTS IN PHRYGIA.

A STUDY IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

III.

THE inscriptions which constitute the foundation of this study belong to what is, as a general rule, the least interesting and the least important class of ancient epigraphic remains—the commonplace epitaph. In the epitaphs of Asia Minor especially a dreary monotony is the rule. A number of formulas are stereotyped, and long series of inscriptions repeat one or other of them with very little variety beyond that of names and dates. During my first journeys in Asia Minor these wearisome epitaphs were a severe trial to my patience, and it seemed almost useless to take the trouble of copying them. Time was precious, and work was pressing, and it was hard to waste minutes or hours in getting access to and copying such uninteresting and valueless

epitaphs. Frequently when an inscription was reported, I got its appearance described, and if the description showed that it was an epitaph declined to waste time in hunting it up, a process which sometimes involves the expenditure of considerable diplomacy, time, and money. In many of the Christian epitaphs, the fact that they are Christian constitutes the sole interest. Otherwise they hardly differ except in the personal names from dozens of their neighbours. But I trust to have shown by the examples already quoted that even from this most despised class of documents intelligent study may derive some important historical conclusions. Varieties of style and formula have been shown to spring from difference in religious training and in social circumstances, and two distinct tides of Christianizing influence, differing in character, have been traced. When Christianity became supreme these provincial differences were proscribed and rapidly disappeared, but it is a distinct gain to know that they ever existed. The Church of north-western Phrygia has been traced, by a hypothesis which has in its favour antecedent probability and a certain amount of positive indications, to a Bithynian origin, and it has been shown that the Bithynian¹ tradition assigned the beginning of Christianity in that country to the visit paid by Paul and Silas to the Troad.² The origin of the other stream of Christianizing

¹ I have assumed the genuineness of the famous disputed letter of Trajan about the Bithynian Christians: it appears to me that the criticism directed upon it has only proved more conclusively that it must be genuine. It forms no part of my task to discuss such points, and the same remark which has been made about Trajan's letter may be applied to some other documents, which I have already quoted or may quote below.

² Without contending that the tradition, mentioned already (*THE EXPOSITOR*, October, 1888, p. 264), of the visit paid by Paul and Silas to the country between Cyzicus and the Rhyndacus is really very ancient in origin, I may mention that the natural way for them to go from Phrygia and Galatia to the Troad (Acts xvi. 6-8) would be through this district, and that the tradition also agrees with the recorded history in not making them appear east of the Rhyndacus in the Roman province of Bithynia.

influence in central and southern Phrygia cannot be doubtful. Antecedent probability is that this influence proceeds from the valley where Laodiceia, Colossæ, and Hierapolis lie; and the documentary evidence is most abundant and characteristic in the districts which lie immediately east and north-east of that valley, and grows less distinctive and approximates more and more to the general type of Christian documents, as we go farther away. Thus the second and chief stream of Christianizing influence also is traced back to St. Paul, from whom the Churches of Laodiceia and Colossæ derived their origin.

It will be best to devote one of these articles to a description of the local limits and of the characteristics of the Church of central and southern Phrygia. But before essaying this task, it is necessary to discuss one preliminary point, which is both of the first importance and of the greatest difficulty—I mean the influence and authority exercised by powerful individuals in founding and consolidating the Church in Phrygia. This subject leads us on to difficult and dangerous ground, a battlefield where controversy has raged without having yet reached a conclusion. I must therefore repeat my warning as to the scope of these Studies. I do not and cannot speak from the point of view of the Church historian. My purpose is only to show that a great amount of neglected evidence bearing on this important period of history is in existence, and is perishing year by year. But the duty of the archæologist is not completed by the mere collection and cataloguing of raw material, or by the publication of the bare text of new documents, however important and in many cases difficult this too thankless task is. The due interpretation of the natural sense of the documents equally belongs to his province. He is bound to study them from his own point of view, and his point of view is totally different from that of the historian, to whom these documents come as mere

small parts of a great mass of evidence, which he looks at with eyes already habituated to a certain view of the subject. The archæologist, on the other hand, is penetrated with the belief that each new document is an end in itself. He has the conviction that all of them are redolent of the soil and atmosphere where they were produced. He familiarizes himself with the tone and colour and spirit of the country, brings himself as much as possible under the influence of its scenery and atmosphere, and tries to realize in full vividness the surroundings in which and the feelings with which the documents that he has to interpret were composed and engraved. I believe that one can hardly insist too strongly on the influence of nature over the human spirit in Phrygia. There is no country where the character of the land has more thoroughly impressed itself on the people, producing a remarkable uniformity of type in the many races which have contributed to form its population. A tone of melancholy, often of monotony, in the landscape, combined with the conditions of agriculture, whose success or failure seems to depend very much on the heavens and very little on human labour, produced a subdued and resigned tone in its inhabitants, a sense of the overpowering might of nature, and a strong belief in and receptivity of the Divine influence. The archæologist who would understand or interpret the unused historical material in Asia Minor must saturate himself with the spirit and atmosphere of the country; and though I feel how far short I fall of the ideal, yet this is the spirit in which I should wish to write. It must be remembered that, in thus studying a single group of documents apart from the general evidence bearing on the subject, there is always a danger of straining their interpretation, and I cannot hope to have wholly escaped this danger.

The obscure and ill-composed epitaph which was pub-

lished above as No. 12,¹ appears to me, with all its miserable Greek, to be one of the most instructive of the Phrygian documents in regard to the tone of the early Christians to their leaders, and I have therefore added the Greek text in a footnote, inasmuch as no translation can ever fairly represent an ancient document. The writer of this epitaph was full of the same feeling which led the Phrygians of the Pentapolis to style their hero of the second century "the equal of the apostles." The leaders and preachers of Phrygia were felt by their converts and disciples to be really the successors of the apostles, and their people entertained for them all the respect and veneration (and we may be sure paid them the unhesitating obedience) which breathes through the title and the epitaph which have just been quoted. Under what actual name these great leaders exercised their authority, I cannot presume to decide: this is a point which must be determined by the Church historians; but, as I said above, the scanty evidence seems to me to point to the conclusion that the title "bishop" was not in ordinary use in the early Phrygian Church. So far as I can presume to hold an opinion the leader and "equal of the apostles" exercised his supreme and implicitly accepted authority under the humble title of presbyter: he was one among a number, and the wide authority which he exercised depended on personal ascendancy, and was not accompanied by any distinguishing official name and express rank. The two typical cases in the second century are Avircius and Montanus. The former is in later history called Bishop of Hierapolis, and it is quite clear

¹ Ἀκύλαν καθορῆς [κα]τέχ[ει, ξ]έν[ε], οὗτος ὁ τύμβος

• • • • • ον θεοῦ ἀνγέλοις τε ποθητόν,

Λαοῦ προστάμενον, νόμῳ τ[ῷ] δίκαια φρονῶν

Ἡρθε [i.e. ἦλθε] δὲ δῶμα θεοῦ μέ[γ]ας ταιμαῖς [τ'] ἀνάπαντι.

In line 3 φρονῶν has been substituted for φρονούντα, which would give better syntax and better metre, and perhaps ἐνθ' was intended instead of ξένε. ταιμαῖς apparently for τιμαῖς: μέτας engraved for μέγας. The rest of the epitaph does not bear on our subject.

that he exercised a personal ascendancy which perhaps surpassed that of the later bishops; but the natural conclusion from the only reference to him in literature, *viz.* the dedication of the tractate against Montanism by his fellow presbyter,¹ is that he was usually styled presbyter. More is known about Montanus, but the evidence is distorted by the prejudice and hatred cherished against a leader, who was held to have betrayed the cause and to have become an apostle of evil. But there can be no doubt that Montanus considered himself to be the apostle of light, and that his character, position, and influence were analogous to those of the other leaders who made the Church of Phrygia, and whose memory has not been kept alive by the brand of heresy. There is not the slightest evidence or even probability that Montanus was ever styled bishop. The opinion is now general that Montanus represented the old school of Phrygian Christianity, as opposed to the organized and regulated hierarchical Church which was making Christianity a power in the world, and that "the chief opponents of the Montanists were the bishops."² The very name Kataphryges, which was given to his followers, shows that he was considered to be a representative of the old Phrygian spirit and custom.

The bishops however won the day; Phrygian custom and the individuality of the Phrygian Church were sacrificed to the uniformity of the Church Catholic. Everything known about the later organization of the Phrygian Church

¹ The anonymous author speaks of "our fellow presbyter, Zoticus of Otrous." Otrous was a town about three miles west of Hierapolis, where Avircius lived. It seems to me that only prepossession can make such a writer as Bonwetsch, after quoting this passage, use it as an argument that Avircius was actually called bishop. The author also addresses him by the respectful phrase *ὁ μακάριε*. The interpretation advocated above, that Avircius had the authority and personal influence of an "equal of the apostles," but only the title of presbyter, seems to explain the evidence of this tractate, and to show why a man who exercised even greater authority than the later bishops received in later documents the title bishop.

Compare Bonwetsch, *Geschichte des Montanismus*, pp. 11, 12, and *passim*.

shows that it was framed according to the civil organization: every city had its bishop, and the bishop of each provincial metropolis exercised a certain authority over the bishops of the cities in his province. No other crisis in the Phrygian Church is known when this organization is likely to have been substituted for the old, looser system of personal authority and influence. One who approaches the subject of Church organization after studying the civil organization of the Anatolian provinces, and who sees the two coinciding with each other as far back as the records reach, is forced to the conclusion that it originated when the Phrygian Church was brought into conformity and closer union with the Church in general, *i.e.* at the Montanist controversy following after A.D. 160.

The bishops indeed won the day, but they did not succeed in making Phrygia thoroughly orthodox, or in putting their system into the hearts of the whole people. We should be glad to find some traces of the true character and tone of Montanism, as described by those who came under its influence. If something was gained in power and uniformity, something also was lost in fervour, by the proscribing of Montanism as a heresy; and the Church in Phrygia certainly ceased to be the Church of Phrygia. Complaints of the heterodoxy and abominable heresies of Phrygia are common in later times. In the scanty records of its history frequently some slight detail suggests that underneath the orthodox hierarchy of bishops another religious system, which lies deeper, gives an occasional sign of its existence. But it eludes our search; the sign, too unsubstantial a ground for argument, melts away as it is examined.¹

"I will go forward, sayest thou,
I shall not fail to find her now.
Look up, the fold is on her brow."

¹ Montanism is a subject which has long had a special interest for me, and on which I have been most eager to discover some evidence.

Montanus was no bishop, but he exercised a practically boundless influence over his followers, and he preserves to us the earlier character of the Phrygian Church. The name however under which authority is exercised is immaterial; the important fact is that widespreading authority and influence of individual teachers is the character of the early Phrygian Church. The Phrygian Church gradually organized itself on the model of the civil organization; but on the whole the change is in the direction of breaking up the more wide-reaching ascendancy of the old leaders. The tendency of the early Byzantine policy in central Asia Minor was to break up the wide territories of the great cities by raising villages or small subject towns to the dignity of independent cities, and the principle was expressly laid down that every city should have its own bishop, an exception being made by Justinian in the case of Isauropolis, which, probably on account of its proximity, was to remain under the authority of the Bishop of Leontopolis.¹ In some cases the Church resisted the principle that civil division should cause ecclesiastical division also, but as a general rule the former was followed as a matter of course by the latter. After much examination and many various attempts, I have at last been driven to the conclusion that the only way of explaining various discrepancies between the civil boundaries of certain provinces in Asia Minor and the ecclesiastical lists is due to old religious connexions or to the personal ascendancy of great religious leaders. To discuss this as fully as the material extends would require an article to itself, but one or two examples which bear specially on our immediate purpose may be here quoted.

¹ I regret to have lost the precise reference, and my memory perhaps deceives me as to the exact details, especially as to the name Leontopolis. I read the sentence in an old collection of extracts from Greek ecclesiastical law in the Bodleian Library, and thought I had also seen it in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, but have recently been unable to find it.

I have frequently mentioned the north-western Phrygian Church as being originally distinct in character from and unconnected with the rest of Phrygia. No one who reads over the first of these articles, and notes the connexion there described between Kotiaion and the country of the Prepenisseis, can fail to be struck when the fact comes before him that in many ecclesiastical lists Kotiaion and the country of the Prepenisseis are separated from the rest of the province, and the bishops of the district placed under the authority of a separate archbishop.¹ I have also argued elsewhere that the omission of Kotiaion from the list of Hierocles is to be explained because he was greatly under the influence of the ecclesiastical lists, which did not class Kotiaion under Phrygia, but reckoned it as autocephalous and subordinate only to the Patriarch of Constantinople and not to the metropolitan of the province. The only addition which I have now to make to the reasoning given in the *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*,² is to connect this independence of the Bishop of Kotiaion with the old religious separation between this part of Phrygia and the rest of the province. A parallel case may be found in Pontus. Euchaita does not occur in Hierocles,

¹ In *Notitiæ Episcopatum* iii., x., xiii., the Metropolitan of Kotiaion has subject to him the bishops of Spore, Kone, and Gaïou Kome. In my *Cities and Bishoprics*, § xc. to xcv., I have shown (long before the point which I am now explaining occurred to me) that these three bishoprics lie on the roads south-east of Kotiaion, the first and third being in the territory of the tribe Prepenisseis, the third being on its border and perhaps partly in it also.

² A writer in the *Church Quarterly* for July, 1888 (p. 309), whose generous praise of my work has been a full reward to me for much toil, of a kind which I should not have voluntarily chosen, presses further than I intended my words, "the list of Hierocles is the list of the bishops of his time," when he understands them (and dissents rightly from them) as meaning "the *synecdemus* itself is ecclesiastical." My rather carelessly expressed sentence was not intended to imply more than that a list of cities is *ipso facto* a list of bishoprics, and *vice versâ*; I did not mean that Hierocles arranges his list as a list of bishoprics would be arranged. Further study however has shown me that the case is more complicated, and that while in most provinces his lists are identical with the ecclesiastical lists, in some (*e.g.* Hellespontus) he has used a different authority. He arranges the cities of Asia Minor always in a geographical order.

though it is an important town often mentioned in history. The probable reason is that it was autokephalous, and therefore not mentioned in ecclesiastical lists in the province of Pontus. This honorary position was probably due, at least in part, to the respect paid to St. Theodore of Euchaita.

Of the apostles and martyrs of the Phrygian Church very little is recorded, and that little is transmitted to us in such suspicious authorities and with such impossible surroundings, that it is very doubtful how far the personages described can be accepted as historical characters. I propose here to examine the evidence about two of these personages, to endeavour to separate the legendary from the historical element in their personality, and to trace how the latter has been preserved in memory and how the former has grown around it. The first case is that of St. Artemon, whose story, connected partly with Laodiceia and partly with Diocæsareia (a town on the southern frontier of Phrygia), abounds in such absurd and puerile miraculous details that the Bollandists themselves entitle it "*elogium fabulosum*." Unfortunately no complete biography of him is known to have been preserved, but several brief accounts of his martyrdom may be found in the *Acta Sanctorum*, October 8th, p. 41 ff. He was a presbyter of Laodiceia in the time of Diocletian. In company with Sisinnius, bishop of Laodiceia, he destroyed the images in a temple, which in one of the accounts is called the temple of Artemis, while in another the deity to whom it was dedicated is Æsculapius. It is to be noted that such vagueness is always a bad sign of the character of these documents. Moreover such conduct is contrary to all that we know about the Christians of Asia Minor, who were advised not to voluntarily give themselves up, much less to wantonly attack the shrines and the holy things of their neighbours. Such an account arose during the period when pagan temples were really being

destroyed by the victorious Christians, and when deeds similar to those of the present were attributed to the heroes of the past. He was arrested on the road from Laodiceia to Diocæsareia,¹ and a hind brought news of his arrest to the Bishop Sisinnius. The javelins which the governor ordered to be hurled at Artemon slew one of his own assessors. A pool, probably the actual lake of Diocæsareia, was produced at the prayers of the saint. Other details are really too grotesque and puerile for repetition.

As the Bollandists have already labelled it, this account obviously belongs to the sphere of legend, not of history. At one time this admission would have been considered a sufficient reason for relegating the document to the limbo of oblivion. In recent time however the study of legend and mythology has become a science. The mere rationalization of legend by omitting the marvellous and leaving a residue of physical possibility is of course an utterly unjustifiable and unscientific process; the residue which is thus obtained is not one whit more historical than the whole legend to which it belongs. Some definite objective evidence, outside of the legend, unconnected with it, and of independent certainty, must be obtained; and the legend tested thereby sometimes yields real information of a very different kind from that which it professes to give. It is now an accepted principle that even the genesis of legend is an historical process, which may throw light at least on the character of the age when the legend grew, if not on the age to which it professes to belong.

The problem now is to find some external evidence which shall furnish a criterion in this particular case. The preceding statement has exhibited the relation of the details

¹ The authorities all say Cæsareia; but Diocæsareia was not very far from Laodiceia, and was in the Roman *conventus* whose administrative centre was at Laodiceia, whereas no city Cæsareia existed in Phrygia. On this point I shall have more to say below.

to actual localities in a way which was impossible until the general survey of Phrygia was organized by the Asia Minor Exploration Committee. We may now say confidently, that the local surroundings are not fictitious, but real. The legend of the origin of the lake of Diocæsareia must have arisen at a time when there was a tendency to connect natural phenomena with the history of Christian saints, and when therefore the veneration of saints possessed a strong hold on the popular mind. In the old pagan time the reason for such phenomena of nature was found in the action of the deities, action of a capricious kind, and not in accordance with general principle. The Christians of Phrygia supplied the place of the old anthropomorphic deities by the saints, who had been the champions of their faith. This same process is a familiar one in the history of religion. Among the Teutonic races we find stories, whose details are among the earliest heirlooms of the Indo-European races, and which were once told about pagan deities, related with only the changed personality of Christ and the apostles. But it must be observed that this explanation presupposes the existence of a widespread respect for the saint; he must have been already venerated before the legend could arise. If we can fix a date for the growth of the legend, we can then say that St. Artemon was then and for some time before that date an object of general veneration in southern Phrygia and the heir to the legendary heritage of the pagan deities.

Fidelity of local detail is one of the most important characteristics of the class of tales which is here described. This class of tales has grown up among the people of a district, and has the character of popular legend; it is to be distinguished from another class which seems to be purely invented and to have no roots in popular belief and no clear local indications. I have here assumed the truth of the discussion of the localities which is given in full else-

where; ¹ the precise amount of evidence in every detail need not be repeated here, but should be carefully scrutinised by those who wish to reach the truth.

In the details of the legend of Artemon no sufficient clue is furnished as to the date of its composition. The transmitted form of one of the versions is later than A.D. 536, for it mentions the governor stationed at Laodiceia under the title *comes*, and Justinian in that year made a new arrangement of the provincial governments, and for the first time placed at Laodiceia a *comes* as governor of Phrygia Pacatiana.² But briefer accounts quoted by the Bollandists from Greek Menæa preserve different forms of the tale; and one which speaks of the temple of Æsculapius, and of the two serpents which lived in it, seems to be of better character, and to show some real knowledge of the time when paganism was still existent, though the length of the serpents is exaggerated to eighty cubits.

Some importance is to be attached to the name Cæsareia. The native name of Diocæsareia was Keretapa. Under the influence of the Græco-Roman civilization, which was diffused in a very superficial way over the central provinces of Asia Minor, the Roman name Diocæsareia was substituted for the vulgar Phrygian name. But this official term never became thoroughly popular, and after a time, probably as early as the fourth century, it passed out of use, and the native name came once more into general employment. The tale of Artemon preserves the recollection of the time when Diocæsareia was the name of the city. But in the later versions of the tale, which alone are

¹ See my papers on "Antiquities of Southern Phrygia and the Border Lands" in *American Journal of Archaeology*, 1897-88, section on Diocæsareia Keretapa.

² The same feature also proves that this version is not later than the century immediately following Justinian. The government of Phrygia was entirely remodelled in the following century, when the Themes were instituted, and probably Laodiceia ceased then to be a seat of government, while the impregnable fortress of Chonai took its place.

preserved, the writer, having no knowledge of the localities, does not understand the now disused name, and substitutes for it the commoner form *Cæsareia*. This slight detail furnishes a valuable proof of the antiquity of the story. It takes us back to a fourth century version, possibly only an oral version, in which St. Artemon was connected both with the small country town of *Diocæsareia* and with the seat of the Roman officials at *Laodiceia*, and in which fidelity of local details was a characteristic. The trial of a townsman of *Diocæsareia* for an offence against Roman law would necessarily be held at the government centre *Laodiceia*, the seat of the *conventus*. In all probability this is the only historical part now recoverable from the legend. The rest consists of floating popular tales, which gathered round the person of the popular Christian hero as a fixed point.

The tale of Artemon is one of many which grew in the popular mind during the fourth century, and many of which assumed literary form during the fifth century. The form in which many of them are written down exhibits to us the historical circumstances which obtained about 400-450 A.D.¹ The Roman officials mentioned bear the titles and perform the functions which belonged to officials of the early Byzantine empire, and which were unknown under the Roman empire. The tales may be taken as evidence of the state of society and belief during the period when they were written. The leading incidents were not invented by the person who gave literary form to the tales. They have the character of popular spontaneous legend, arising among a people not highly educated, about personages whose memory was preserved by religious veneration and by actual Church ceremonial. This point is the key-stone of the view which is here

¹ Perhaps some other version of the Artemon-legend may yet be found in MS., earlier and more detailed than those which are published.

expressed. The permanence and unalterableness of religious ritual, as distinguished from the fluctuation of mere oral tradition and popular legend, make it the one sure guide in the study of mythology. If memorial ceremonies kept alive the recollection of the more distinguished martyrs, the popular imagination was kept right in some main details, while the importance thus given to their personality made them fixed centres round which floating details and vague beliefs gathered. It is, I believe, a fact that such memorial services were performed in honour of the great saints of the early Church, and that at these services such discourses as that of Gregory Nyssen on the Forty Martyrs were delivered; though on such a point I speak with all diffidence. Such was the way in which the memory of St. Artemon was kept fresh by thoroughly trustworthy evidence as to some of the main facts, and yet his personality became a centre of mere popular tales.

I do not of course maintain that all tales of Asian saints rank in the class. Each one must be examined separately, and vividness of local detail is one of the chief criteria for admitting any tale into this class. My purpose is only to show that some tales do belong to this class; but several examples might be given of tales, which have not the slightest trace of local colouring or reality about them.

While the general facts were given by popular legend, the literary form is due to the genius, or want of genius, of the writer. How much should be attributed to the former cause, and how much to the latter, it is not possible to determine absolutely, though an approximation may be made in each case, and something may be learned about the ability and character of the writer in the cases where a longer biography is preserved. It is not certain whether the hand of a single writer is to be traced throughout, or whether there was a general wave of hagiography over Asia Minor. Probably such a general tendency did charac-

terize the fifth century, but at the same time it may be possible to trace the work of the same writer in several biographies. The whole subject however requires patient investigation, and I cannot hope to have hit the truth entirely, much less to have exhausted what might be learned, in these remarks, which are founded only on a hasty perusal of part of the material, undertaken at first for purposes of topography, and made in the intervals of a busy life devoted chiefly to other pursuits. I shall be entirely satisfied if I succeed in drawing more attention to the Christian antiquities of Asia Minor, and in arousing others to correct me and to do better what I here do imperfectly.

It is possible that the foregoing remarks may be held extravagant, but I think it best to draw with rigorous logic the conclusions that seem to follow from the principles enunciated; and those who consider that the conclusions involve too great a strain on their credulity will scrutinize with proper severity the premises from which they are deduced.

It has fortunately happened that in the explorations carried out in connexion with the Asia Minor Exploration Fund indubitable evidence was discovered of the historical character of another Phrygian saint, in whom the legendary and fantastic and marvellous element is almost as strongly marked as in the tale of Artemon. Here we have a case where it is possible to compare the legend with the historical facts, to trace the origin of the legendary details, and to show the real facts out of which some of them grew. The whole circumstances furnish a striking example of the way in which archæological evidence may be used to estimate and establish the authority of semi-historical documents. Assuming all that has been said by the Bishop of Durham in this magazine, January, 1885, p. 3 ff., on the special legend which I have to discuss, I shall, in the first place, enumerate the main points in the tale, so as to bring out both the purely fictitious character and the probable

origin of many of them, and also to show something of the character of the writer who first put the tale in literary form. My view is that he wrote about 390-410 A.D., that he was a man of fair education and knowledge, and that many details are not of such a character as he would be likely to invent, but bear all the marks of free creative popular mythology.

It is possible that the tale has passed through subsequent editions; but on this point I express no opinion. In the main, I hold that it may be considered as a document of 400 A.D. It may be mentioned that this date was proposed by me in 1883. M. l'Abbé Duchesne argued against my reasons and advocated a sixth century date. I have replied to his arguments in a later paper, and I am glad to find my opinion corroborated by such an authority as the Bishop of Durham.¹

When Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Verus were emperors, there went forth a decree that all should sacrifice to the gods. Publius, who was governor of Lesser Phrygia, carried out the command in his own province, and in particular the senate and people of Hierapolis, clad in white apparel, offered solemn sacrifice. Aberkios,² who was Bishop of Hierapolis, seeing what was being done, prayed in anguish of spirit for great part of a day, and then falling asleep, beheld in a dream a young man of noble aspect, who put a staff in his hand and bade him destroy therewith the

¹ "The Tale of St. Abercius" in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* in 1892, p. 339 ff.; L. Duchesne in *Revue des Questions Historiques*, July, 1883, p. 1 ff.; *Cities and Bishoprics*, part ii., § xxviii., 1887; Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, vol. i., p. 483. A difficulty which I found in my own view (*Cit. and Bish.*, vol. i., p. 425), and which is cleared away by Bishop Lightfoot, is now disposed of by other reasons on a more careful examination of the stone.

² I use here the spelling of the biography (see *Acta Sanctorum*, October 22nd). A few pages previously I used the second century spelling Avircius, which occurs in the anonymous treatise against Montanism. During the third century it became customary to use β where older documents use ν to express the sound of our *v* or *w*. I call Aberkios the hero of the legend, Avircius the historical character.

false gods. Awakening full of zeal, Aberkios took a large piece of wood, and going about the ninth hour to the temple of Apollo, which was the chief sanctuary of the city, he forced open the doors, and rushing in overthrew and broke in pieces the statue of the god. Thereafter he broke in succession the statues of all the other gods which were in the temple. Neither did the gods themselves interfere to save themselves, proving thus by their inaction the folly of men in worshipping and calling gods mere stocks and stones, nor did the ministers of the temple, who were struck with astonishment, raise a hand against him in defence of their deities: and Aberkios, after pointing the moral to be drawn from the helplessness of the deities whose sacred images he had broken, retired to his own home like a victor from battle. Towards evening the ministers of the temple recovered from their astonishment, and formally accused Aberkios before the municipal senate. In the morning a meeting of the people was held in the temple to deliberate. The mob were eager to burn the house of Aberkios over his head; but the senate, fearing that the conflagration might spread, and that they might be involved in trouble with the governor of the province, resolved to arrest Aberkios and any associates whom he might have, and send all for trial before the governor.¹ During the delay caused by the difference of opinion in the public meeting certain of the Christians came to warn Aberkios of the design against him, and found him engaged in instructing the crowds who resorted to him. His friends advised him to retire for a short time from the city; but he declined to do so, and going forth into the marketplace he began to teach in public.

¹ In that case they would have been sent to Synnada, the seat of the *conventus* (assuming for the moment the historical character of the incident), just as it was shown above that Artemon must have been sent from Diocesareia to Laodiceia for trial.

The multitude were now roused to greater fury when news was brought into the temple of this open defiance. The senators could no longer restrain them, and they rushed to the marketplace to kill the saint. As they approached him, three young men possessed by demons, hurried forth in front of them, with foaming mouths and squinting eyes, biting their own hands, and calling out, "We adjure thee by the true and only God, whom thou preachest, not to torment us before our time." All stood still, and gazed on the saint, who, after praying aloud, touched the young men with the staff which he carried, and ordered the evil spirits to come out of them. They were healed forthwith, and from henceforth would never leave the side of Aberkios. The multitude, to a man, renounced idolatry and were converted on the spot. As it was too late to baptize them that day, the ceremony was postponed till the morrow, and many of the new converts spent the whole night in the open marketplace. On the next day five hundred persons were baptized.

Such is the scene with which the biography of Aberkios opens. Its utterly fabulous character is plain. Examining it a little more closely, we can see that it could not arise until long after the events which it relates. I have in the preceding paper described the true character of the struggle which took place in the second and third centuries. It was not a struggle between the religion of Christ and the religion of Apollo or Jupiter; it was a struggle between the supreme State religion, the worship of the emperors, and the religion which claimed to be sole and universal. In this tale there is not a word about such an aspect of the religious question; and it cannot therefore have arisen so long as such a question was placed alone before the world. But in the attempted revival of paganism by the Emperor Julian, in 361-363 A.D., the question was different. The attempt was then actually made to restore the worship of the old gods, Apollo and

Jupiter and the rest; and the tale, which could not have arisen before this time, might very naturally come into existence after it.

It is probable that the name Apollo is true to nature. I need not here enter on the point, but it can be shown that the god of Hierapolis was identified with the Greek Apollo, and was frequently called by that name by Greek speakers. In reality he was a purely Phrygian deity, a sun-god, who in some respects, and especially as a god of prophecy and as a solar deity, approximated to the character of the Greek Apollo. Remains, which I take to be those of the temple of Hierapolis, can still be traced just appearing above the soil at a wretched village called Kotch Hissar; they are of great extent, and are built of unusually large blocks of stone, in a style which seems to be older than the Roman domination. The tale arose before recollection had ceased of the time when a temple of Apollo at Hierapolis had been the chief sanctuary of the whole Pentapolis.¹ The picture of the senate and people clad in white is true to Roman custom: the touch is due to the writer, and implies that either he had actually seen such a ceremony in the time of Julian, or that he had learned it by reading Roman authors. Most of the opening scene probably is due to the writer's free invention. It has not the character of popular legend, but appears to be written in free imitation and exaggeration of passages in the New Testament by a person who had actually seen or heard from eye-witnesses about ceremonies held in the temple of Apollo at Hierapolis.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(*To be continued.*)

¹ I have treated this point in a paper "Trois Villes Phrygiennes," in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique*, 1882.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

VII. CHRIST AND MOSES (CHAP. III.).

THE remarkable statement concerning the nature and way of salvation contained in the section which we have been considering in the three last papers supplies ample material for a new exhortation. The writer has shown that the Christian salvation consists in nothing less than lordship in the world to come. He has set forth Christ as the Captain of this salvation, and the High Priest of the new people of God, the Moses and the Aaron of Christendom, and in both capacities as the Sanctifier of the sons of God whom He leads to glory, and, in order to the efficient discharge of that function, one with His brethren in nature and experience. The immense supply of motive power stored up in this densely packed group of thoughts he now brings to bear on the tempted Hebrew Christians as an inducement to steadfastness: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus."

Every word here is an echo of something going before, and is instinct with persuasive virtue. "Brethren" of Him who in a fraternal spirit identified Himself with the unholy, and for their sakes took flesh and tasted death. "Holy," at least in standing, in virtue of the priestly action of the Sanctifier; and because holy in this sense, under obligation to make their consecration to God a reality by living a truly Christian life. "Partakers of a heavenly calling"—thus described, at once with truth and with rhetorical skill, with a backward glance at the greatness of the Chris-

tian's hope as the destined lord of the future world, and with a mental reference to the contrast between that glorious prospect and the present state of believers as partakers of flesh and blood, and subject to death and the fear thereof; reminding them at the same time of the blessed truth that as Christ became partaker of their present lot, so they were destined to be partakers of His glorious inheritance, the unity and fellowship between Him and His people being on both sides perfect and complete. The epithet "heavenly" gracefully varies the point of view from which the inheritance is contemplated. The world to come becomes now a world above, a celestial country. The change in the mode of expression is an oratorical variation, but it is more, even a contribution to the parenetic force of the sentence, for the heavenly in the thought of the writer here and throughout the epistle is the real, the abiding. Heaven is the place of realities, as this material world is the place of shadows. Such is our author's philosophic view-point, if we may ascribe such a thing to him, his way of contemplating the universe, supposed by some to be borrowed from Philo and the Alexandrine school of philosophy; certainly a marked peculiarity, whencesoever derived. With the heavenly world Christianity is identified, and thereby its absolute and abiding nature is strongly asserted, as against Judaism, which as belonging to the visible world is necessarily doomed to pass away. This contrast indeed does not find open expression here, but that it is in the writer's mind the sequel abundantly shows. He uses his philosophy for his apologetic purpose, employing it as a vehicle for expressing and defending the thesis: Judaism transient, Christianity for aye.¹

The titles here ascribed to Jesus also arise out of the previous context, and are full of significance. Specially

¹ On this point *vide* Pfeiderer's *Paulinismus*, p. 326.

noteworthy is the former of the two, "Apostle," here only applied to Christ. The use of this epithet in reference to our Lord is one of many indications of the fresh creative genius of the writer, and of the unconventional nature of his style. When he calls Christ an apostle he is not thinking of the twelve apostles, or of Christ's prophetic office. Christ's claim to attention as one through whom God has spoken His last word to men he has sufficiently recognised and insisted on in the first exhortation (ii. 1-4). He is thinking rather of the apostleship of Moses. The basis for the title is such a text as Exodus iii. 10: "Come now therefore, and I will send thee (*ἀποστείλω*, Sept.) unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth My people the children of Israel out of Egypt." Moses was an apostle, as one sent by God on the important mission of leading the enslaved race of Israel out of Egypt into Canaan. Christ was our Apostle, as one sent by God to be the Leader in the greater salvation. The Apostle of our Christian confession and the "Captain of salvation" are synonymous designations. Something indeed might be said for taking it as a generic title, including all Christ's functions. In that case it might have stood alone, though even then special mention of the priestly office would have been appropriate, as having been previously named, and as a source of peculiar comfort and inspiration, and also because it is in the sequel the subject of a lengthened consideration. As applied to it the exhortation to consider has a somewhat different meaning from that which it bears in reference to the title Apostle. "Consider the Apostle" means, consider for practical purposes a subject already sufficiently understood; "consider the High Priest" means, consider the doctrine of Christ's priesthood, that ye may first understand it, and then prove its practical value.

Christ the Apostle is the immediate subject of contemplation. That aspect is in view throughout the third and

fourth chapters, the priestly aspect being presented at the close of the latter, as an introduction to the long discussion which commences with the fifth chapter and extends to the tenth. "Consider the Apostle of our confession" is the rubric of this new section.

To guide consideration, a point of view is suggested congruous to the practical aim. The aim being to promote steadfastness in the Christian faith and life, the selected point of view is the fidelity of Jesus our Apostle. "Who was faithful to Him that made Him." In other words, "faithful to His vocation." God made Jesus, as in 1 Samuel xii. 6 He is said to have made Moses and Aaron. The underlying idea is, that it is God in His providence who raises up all great actors in human affairs and prepares them for their position as public men. God made Jesus by giving Him His unique place in the world's history, as the chief agent in the work of redemption. And Jesus was faithful to God by discharging faithfully the high duties entrusted to Him. What the Hebrews are invited to do therefore, is to consider Jesus as the faithful Captain of salvation, who never betrayed His trust, shirked His responsibilities, or neglected duty to escape personal suffering, and who at the last great crisis said, "Not My will, but Thine be done." For of course the theatre in which Christ's fidelity was displayed was His earthly life of trial and temptation. True, it is present fidelity that is asserted (*πιστὸν ὄντα*), nevertheless the rendering "who was faithful" is practically correct. What is meant is, that Jesus is one who by His past career has earned the character of the Faithful One; that is the honourable title to which in virtue of a spotless record He is fully entitled. The field of observation is His public ministry on earth, assumed to be familiar to readers of the epistle, either through our written gospels, or through the unwritten evangelical tradition. What end could be served by pointing to a

fidelity displayed in heaven? Fidelity there costs no effort; but fidelity maintained amid constant temptation to unfaithfulness is worth remarking on, and may fitly be commended to the admiring contemplation of the tempted. Then how inappropriate the comparison between Christ and Moses, if the fidelity ascribed to the former were that exercised in the heavenly state! The faithfulness of Moses, which drew forth the Divine commendation, was certainly exercised on earth, and could fitly be compared to that of Jesus only if the virtue were in both cases practised under similar conditions. This then is what the writer holds up to the view of his readers as an example and source of inspiration—the faithfulness of Jesus to God in the fulfilment of His vocation during His earthly life. He has already held up Jesus as Priest, as one who is faithful to the interests of those for whom He transacts before God, and therefore entitled to their confidence. The two views supplement each other, and complete the picture of the Faithful One. Faithful as Priest to men in virtue of sympathies learned on earth, faithful as Apostle to God in the execution of the arduous mission on which He was sent to the world; in the one aspect inspiring trust, in the other exciting admiration and inciting to imitation.

The following comparison between Christ and Moses at once serves the general end of the epistle by contributing to the proof of the superiority of Christianity to Judaism, and the special end of the present exhortation by affording the opportunity of extracting wholesome lessons from the fate of the people whom Moses led out of Egypt. The task of exalting Christ above Moses was a delicate one, requiring careful handling; but the tact of the writer does not desert him here. With rhetorical skill he first places the lesser apostle beside the greater One, as one who like Him had been faithful to his commission. In doing this, he simply does justice to the familiar historical record of the Jewish

hero's life, and to God's own testimony borne on a memorable occasion, the substance of which he repeats in the words, "as also Moses (was faithful) in his house." "My servant Moses, faithful in all My house, he,"¹ God had said emphatically, to silence murmuring against him on the part of his brother Aaron and his sister Miriam. In presence of such strong commendation proceeding from the Divine lips, our author, writing to Hebrews proud of their great legislator, might well have been afraid to say anything which even seemed to disparage him, and one wonders what words he will find wherewith to praise Christ and set Him above Moses, without appearing to set aside the testimony of Jehovah to the worth of His servant. But the gifted Christian doctor knows how to manage this part, as well as all other parts of his argument. He lays hold of the suggestive words "house" and "servant" and turns them to account for his purpose, saying in effect, "Moses was as faithful as any servant in a house can be: still he was only a servant, while He of whom I now speak was not a mere servant in the house, but a son; and that makes all the difference."

Verses 3 to 6a are substantially just the working out of this thought. So much in general is clear; but when we look closely into these sentences, we find them a little hard to interpret, owing to an apparent confusion of thought. There seem to be two builders of the house: Christ (ver. 3), it being natural to assume that he who hath builded the house is the same with him who is said to have more glory than Moses, and God (ver. 4), the builder of all things. Then the same man Moses figures in two characters: first, as the house (ver. 3), then as a servant in the house (ver. 5). The former of these puzzles is disposed of in various ways by the commentators. Some say there are two houses and

¹ Num. xii. 7.

two builders: the Old Testament house, whereof God was builder; and the New Testament house, whereof Christ was the builder. Others say, there is one house and one builder: the one house being God's supremely, Christ's subordinately, and the builder God as the first great cause, using His Son as His agent in building the spiritual house as well as in making the worlds. A third class agreeing that there is but one house and one builder, make the builder Christ, and render the last clause of ver. 4, "He that buildeth all things is Divine," taking *θεός* without the article as a predicate, and finding in it an argument for Christ's divinity. The truth doubtless is, that the house is one, even God's, in which Moses was servant, in which Christ is the Son, that house being the Church essentially one and the same, though varying in form under the earlier and the later dispensations; whereof the builder and maker is He that made all things, building it through His Son. The other difficulty regarding the double character of Moses disappears when it is explained that the word *οἶκος* is used in a comprehensive sense, as signifying not merely the stone and lime, so to speak, or even the furniture, but likewise the household, or establishment of servants. In this sense Moses, being a servant in the house of God, was a part of the house, and therefore inferior to the builder; for if he who builds a house hath more honour than the whole house, *à fortiori* he hath more honour than any part of it.

Jesus is a Son, Moses was a servant; such, apart from all minute questions of interpretation, is the ground on which the greater glory is claimed for the former. But it may be asked, the subject of comparison being the respective fidelities of the two apostles, is not a reference to their positions irrelevant? What does it matter whether Moses was son or servant, if he was faithful in all God's house, in all parts of his work as the leader of Israel? If one were comparing two commanders in respect of bravery and

military genius, would it not be an irrelevance to say of one of them, he was the better man, for he was the king's son? The question is pertinent, but it admits of a satisfactory answer. Reference to the superior dignity of Christ is relevant, if His position as Son tended to enhance His fidelity. That it did the writer doubtless meant to suggest. Farther on we find him saying, "Though He was a Son, yet learned He obedience." Similarly he says here in effect: "Christ, though a Son, was faithful to His vocation amid trial." It is a just thought. Beyond doubt we have in Christ as Son a more sublime moral spectacle of fidelity than in any ordinary man called to play a great and responsible part in history. To the fidelities which He has in common with other men, the Son adds this other: resolute resistance to the temptation to use His sonship as an excuse for declining arduous heroic tasks. "If Thou be the Son of God, use Thy privilege for Thine own advantage," said the tempter in the wilderness, and all through life. "Get thee behind Me, Satan," was the Son's constant reply, giving to His faithfulness to God and duty a unique quality and value.

But there is more than this to be said. The reference to the dignity of Christ looks beyond the immediate parenetic purpose to the ultimate aim of the whole epistle. It is designed to insinuate the great truth that Christianity is the absolute, eternal religion. For there is more in this statement concerning Christ and Moses than meets the ear, thoughts suggested, though not plainly expressed. One great idea never absent from the writer's mind is here quietly insinuated by aptly chosen phrases and pregnant hints—the transient nature of the old dispensation in contrast to the abiding nature of the new. This idea casts its shadow on the page at three different points:

1. In the contrast between Moses and Jesus as respectively servant and Son.

2. In the representation of the ministry of Moses as being for a testimony of things to be spoken afterwards, ver. 5: εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων.

3. In the representation of Christians as pre-eminently though not exclusively God's, Christ's, house: οὐ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ver. 6.

In the first, because, as Christ Himself once said, "The servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever." And with the servant the service also must pass away. In the second also, in spite of the difficulties which have been raised by Bleek and others, who hold that the things to be spoken of were the things spoken by Moses himself to the people of Israel, and the idea intended, that the fidelity he had hitherto exhibited ought to secure respect for all he might say in future, and protect him from such assaults as were made upon him by his brother and sister. Bleek thinks that, had a reference to Christ been meant, the writer would have written, "to be spoken in the end of the days," or "by the Son." But over against the verbal difficulty arising out of the use of λαληθησομένων without qualifying phrase is to be set the far greater difficulty of believing that the writer meant to utter in such a connexion so paltry a thought as the one above indicated. How much more congenial to the whole style of the epistle to find here a hint of the truth that Moses in his whole ministry was but a testimony to things to be spoken in the future by another greater Apostle!

The transient nature of the Mosaic ministry as subservient to the enduring ministry of the Son is a third time hinted at in the words, *whose house are we*. This is not a claim of monopoly of family privileges for Christians, but it is an assertion that the Christian community is in an emphatic sense the house of God. The assertion manifestly implies the transiency of the Mosaic system. It suggests the thought that the house as it stood in the

times of Moses was but a rude, temporary model of the true, eternal house of God; good enough to furnish shelter from the elements, so to speak, but unfit to be the everlasting dwelling place of the children of the Most High, therefore destined to be superseded by a more glorious structure, having the Spirit of God for its architect, which should be to the old fabric as was the "magnifical" temple of Solomon to the puny tabernacle in the wilderness.

At ver. 6b transition is naturally made from Moses to the lessons of the wilderness life of Israel. The writer is haunted by the fear lest the tragic fate of the generation of the exodus should be repeated in the experience of the Hebrew Christians. He hopes that the powerful motives arising out of the truths he has stated may bring about a better result. But he cannot hide from himself that another issue is possible. For the future fortunes of Christianity he has no anxiety; he is firmly persuaded that it will prosper, though the Hebrew Church, or even the whole Hebrew nation, should perish. That fatal catastrophe he dreads; therefore with great solemnity he proceeds to represent retention of their position in the house of God as conditional: *Whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the boasting of the hope.* He does not express himself so strongly here as in ver. 14, where the thought is repeated by way of applying the lesson taught in the quotation from the Psalter concerning the conduct of Israel in the wilderness.¹ He is content for the present simply to indicate that there is room for doubt or fear. By the use of the qualifying words *παρρησίαν* and *καύχημα* he teaches by implication that the Christian hope is worth holding fast. It must be a sure and glorious hope which inspires in those who cherish it confidence and exultation.

¹ *ἐάν* strengthened by the particle *περ*, which intensifies the doubt, and the words "to the end" (*μέχρι τέλους*) added: "We are made partakers of Christ *if*, that is to say, we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm *to the end.*"

In the sequel the grounds both of the hope and of the fear are set forth. Of the fear first, the material for the demonstration being drawn from the wilderness history of Israel, as referred to in a quotation from the ninety-fifth Psalm. First comes the quotation itself, in vers. 7-11, connected with what goes before by *διό*, and introduced as an utterance of the Holy Spirit. The quotation keeps pretty close to the Septuagint, materially diverging only at ver. 9, where "forty years" is connected with the clause "they saw My works," instead of with "I was grieved with this generation," as in the Hebrew and the Septuagint. This change led to another, the insertion of *διό* at the commencement of ver. 10. This divergence is intentional, as we see from ver. 12, where the writer reverts to the original connexion, which there suits his purpose, asking, "But with whom was He grieved for forty years?" He prefers here to represent the people of Israel as seeing God's works forty years, rather than to speak of God as grieved with them for the same space—both being equally true,—because he is anxious to make the case of the ancient Israel as closely parallel as possible to that of the Hebrew Christians, with a view to enhanced impressiveness. For both parties were very similarly situated in this very respect of seeing God's works for forty years. From the time when Jesus began His public ministry, to the destruction of Jerusalem, an event very nigh at hand when the epistle was written, was, as near as can be calculated, forty years. What a significant, solemn hint to beware is contained for the Christian Hebrews in this statement concerning their forefathers, *And saw My works forty years!*¹ It says more powerfully than express words could: "You too have seen

¹ The liberty taken with the words of the Psalm in altering the connexion might be adduced as a fact helping to fix the date of the epistle. The manipulation of the forty years may reasonably be regarded as evidence that such a period of time had elapsed since the beginning of the Christian Church.

the works of the Lord, greater works than the ancient ones wrought by the hand of Moses, for the very same space of time. Take care that ye see them to better purpose, lest their doom, or a worse, overtake you.”¹

Next follows the application of the quotation to the case of the Hebrew Christians (vers. 12-14). *Take heed, brethren, lest haply there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God. But exhort each other every day, while the word “to-day” is named, lest any one of you be hardened by the deceit of sin. For we are become partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence firm to the end.* The διό of ver. 7 is to be taken along with βλέπετε, all that lies between being regarded as a parenthesis. “Wherefore—beware,” the beware being charged with solemn significance by the intervening quotation, conceived by the writer as spoken by the Holy Ghost directly to the Christian Church living in the era of the final revelation. The earnest exhortation follows closely the sense of the passage quoted from the Psalter. First, the brethren are warned against an unbelieving heart revealing its wickedness in apostasy from the living God, in allusion to the hardness of heart charged against Israel, and spoken of as the source of their unbelief and misbehaviour. Then homiletic use is made of the hortatory word: *To-day if ye will hear His voice.* “Exhort each other daily while to-day is named, while there is a to-day to speak of, while

¹ One other point in the quotation may be noticed. The psalmist, in using the wilderness history for the instruction of his own generation, alludes to two instances in which God was tempted; viz. at Massah, at the beginning of the forty years, and at Meribah, towards their close. This point is obscure in the Septuagint, which takes the names as abstract nouns, in which it is followed by our author. The psalmist selects the incidents at the beginning and the end of the wilderness history as examples of the conduct of Israel throughout the whole period of the wandering. “From these two learn all,” he would say; the behaviour of Israel being such that God might justly complain, “Forty years was I grieved with this generation,” the very similarity of the events serving to show how incorrigible a generation it was, given to repeating its offences, learning nothing from experience.

the day of grace lasts. Let each cry in the ear of a brother negligent or slothful, To-day, brother, to-day hear His voice, lest your heart become hardened by the deceit of sin, every to-morrow making repentance and faith more difficult." The solemn character of the admonition is excused by the remark, "for we are become partakers of Christ¹ if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." This is the sentiment of ver. 6 expanded, with marked emphasis on the words ἀρχή and τέλος. The writer wishes to impress on his readers that it is not enough to have begun, not enough to have once known the confidence and joy of the Christian hope, that all turns on persevering to the end. And he would have them further understand that perseverance is not a matter of course, that there is a real risk of an ill ending where there has been a fair beginning. For this purpose he again falls back on his quotation, to show that a disastrous end after a fair beginning is not an imaginary evil (vers. 15-19).

In ver. 15 we have the formula by which the writer makes reference to the previously given quotation. It is loose and vague, and has given rise to much difference of opinion. Literally rendered it is, "In its being said, To-day if ye will hear His voice harden not your hearts, as in the provocation"; and the question is, What does the phrase "in its being said" mean? My own idea is, that its sole object is to recall attention to the quotation with a view to some further reflections on it intended to substantiate the statement made in ver. 14. The writer, as it were, says to his readers, "Look at that Scripture again, my brethren, and after you have carefully reperused it let me ask you a series of questions on it." He means them to read or recall to mind the whole passage, though he quotes only the first verse; for the questions which follow go over

¹ On the expression μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, vide the end of this paper.

the whole ground, and bring to bear the whole teaching of the extract for the purpose he has in view.

The first verse of the quotation having been repeated with an "etc." attached, the series of questions follows, the first, founded on the verse quoted, being put in ver. 16. For it is now universally admitted that this verse in both its members is to be rendered interrogatively, not as in the Authorized English Version, which makes sad havoc of the sense in rendering, "Some when they had heard did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses." In this version our translators were but following the unanimous exegetical tradition of previous ages, and till the time of Bengel it occurred to no one that the *τινες* at the beginning of the verse was the interrogative *τίνες*, not the indefinite pronoun *τινès*. The fact that for ages men could be content with so unmeaning an interpretation as the latter yields is an extreme illustration of the sequacious habits of commentators. It requires courage to forsake fashion in exegesis no less than in other things.

"Who," asks the writer, "having heard provoked? Was it not all they who came out of Egypt by Moses?" Thus rendered, the words manifestly bear very directly on the purpose in hand, which is to impress on the Hebrews that a warning against apostasy is not superfluous or impertinent as addressed to persons who have believed in Jesus. The questions asked remind them that the men who provoked God in the desert were all of them persons that had *started* on the journey from the land of bondage to the land of promise. The second of the two questions, which answers the first, reminds the Hebrews of the notorious fact that the persons who were guilty of the sin of provoking God were so numerous, and the exceptions so few, that they might be represented as co-extensive with the whole generation that came out of Egypt.

The following verse (17) contains a second couple of ques-

tions based on the statement, "Wherefore I was grieved with this generation." "And with whom was He grieved forty years? Was it not with them that sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?" In other words, the men who grieved God for forty years were men who for their sins were not permitted to enter Canaan, though they left Egypt in that hope and expectation, but were doomed to die in the desert, leaving their flesh to feed the vultures and their bones to bleach on the burning sands. A fact surely full of warning to those who had set out with high hopes on the way to the heavenly country to beware of coming short through unbelief and ungodliness.

Verse 18 contains a third pair of questions based on the last sentence of the quotation: "So I swear in My wrath, They shall not enter into My rest." "And to whom swear He that they should not enter into His rest? Was it not to them that were disobedient?" The aim here is to point out the cause of failure in the case of ancient Israel, *viz.* disobedience, having its root in unbelief, to give weight to the warning addressed to the Hebrew Christians. To make the meaning if possible still more plain and emphatic there is appended to the series of questions the final reflection: "So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief."

Summing up the import of these questions, the first pair shows that it is not enough to begin the life of faith, that it is necessary to hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end. The second shows that a good beginning does not of itself insure a good ending, that many begin well who end ill. The third points out the cause of such disastrous failures—unbelief in the heart, manifesting itself in disobedience and apostasy in the outward life. The drift of the whole is the same as that of 1 Corinthians x., in which, after reminding the Corinthians how many of the Israelites perished in the wilderness for their sins,

though they had been baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and had eaten of the mystic bread and drunk of the water that sprang out of the smitten rock, the apostle goes on to say, "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

I must now go back on an expression occurring in this chapter which has not yet been specially considered: "partakers of Christ" (*μέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*), ver. 14. What does this mean? The first idea that suggests itself is that "Christ" stands as a synonym and compendium of salvation, just as "Moses" in the above-quoted words of Paul is a synonym for the redemption he was God's instrument in achieving. An alternative course is open to the interpreter: to render, "partakers *with* Christ," and to find in the words the thought that only such as persevere in faith share in the glory and the joy conferred on Him at the close of His earthly career as God's faithful Apostle. This view however, though true in itself, attains to its full rights only when we adopt a bolder course, and take *μέτοχοι* as meaning here, as in i. 9, "companions" or "fellows." We then get the striking thought that by persistent loyalty to the Christian vocation we become fellows of Jesus. It is intrinsically likely that the passage about the Messiah quoted from the forty-fifth Psalm in the first chapter was present to the writer's mind at this point. It speaks of Messiah as anointed with the oil of gladness above His fellows, implying that they too, in their measure, have a full cup of joy. In the present connexion of thought mention is made of a "boasting of hope," a hope rising into exultation, implying a still higher measure of triumphant joy when hope reaches its consummation. The idea, "the faithful the fellows of Christ," is also in full sympathy with the thought

expressed in ver. 6, "whose house are we." The faithful are God's house, at the head of which is Christ, God's Son. They are God's house not, as Moses was, as servants, but as sons, therefore the brethren of Christ. But brotherhood is a thing of degrees. There is an initial brotherhood, in which, as Paul says, a son differs nothing from a servant; and there is a brotherhood, the result of a normal moral development, in which a younger son, at length arrived at maturity, becomes the companion of the elder brother. We are brethren to begin with, but if we are faithful we shall end in becoming fellows. And so our author, having already said of those who persevere that they are the house of God, now takes a step in advance, and in renewing his exhortation to steadfastness says, "The faithful are not only the house of God and the brethren of Christ, they are His fellows, sharing His joy and having perfect communion with Him in spirit."

We now know who are the *μέτοχοι* of Messiah alluded to in i. 9. They are not the angels, as we might have supposed, and as some commentators have said;¹ they are men, men who have passed bravely through the tribulations of life, and been faithful even to death. We have in the text before us a complementary truth to that stated in ii. 16. Christ took not hold of angels, it is said there; Christ's fellows are not angels, but faithful men, it is said here in effect. It is nowise improbable that such a thought should be found in our epistle. It is just such a thought as we should expect to find in a writing from the pen of one who grasped the signification of the great principle—Sanctifier and sanctified of one all. It is but the other side of that grand truth. The first side exhibited is Christ's unity with those He undertakes to sanctify, and His

¹ "If any special force be attached to the expression here, it no doubt means the angels, as dwellers in the city of God, and thus the fellows of the Son" (Davidson, on i. 9).

willing acceptance of all the conditions necessary to His complete identification with them. The other side is the unity of the sanctified with Christ, complete equality with Him in privilege. In crediting the writer with the sentiment, "faithful men the fellows of Christ," we merely assume that he understands his own system of thought; and I may add that he is familiar with the teaching of Christ, and with the conception of the relation between Christ and His people that pervades the entire New Testament. For the sentiment in question is no "fine modern idea," but one which we find again and again stated in bold, inspiring terms. "Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me; that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom." "Well done, good and faithful servant: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together." "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life." "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with My Father in His throne." Christ, Paul, James, John, all say the same thing. Is it strange to find a thought common to them, and familiar to the minds of all heroic men in the ages of fiery trial, getting recognition also in this epistle?

On all these grounds I conclude that the true rendering of this text is, "We are become companions, partners, or fellows of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." Its aim is to proclaim the fulness of joy awaiting those who play the hero's part, not to assert the total forfeiture of salvation, of even a minimum share in the blessing of Christ, by those who sink below the heroic level. It presents the motives to steadfastness under

the most attractive and stimulating form; for what can be conceived more desirable than comradeship with the Faithful One in the "land of the leal"?¹

A. B. BRUCE.

CHRISTIAN INTERPOLATIONS IN JEWISH WRITINGS.

THE hypothesis of Vischer² in regard to the Apocalypse, for which Harnack became sponsor, has attracted the attention of students of the New Testament. Briefly stated it is this. The kernel of the book of the Revelation is a Jewish Apocalypse. A Christian writer translated this from an Aramaic original, adding a Christian introduction (i.-iii.), and a Christian ending (xxii. 6-21), and interspersing Christian interpolations, notably the passages in which the Lamb is mentioned, interpolations however which can be easily distinguished, and whose removal admits the light into dark places. Thus according to Vischer chapter xii., "the touchstone by which it must be proved of what spirit the seer is," describes the birth and the assumption of a purely Jewish Messiah.

In order to test this method of criticism, which Vischer

¹ Delitzsch, among recent commentators, holds the view advocated above, taking μέτοχοι as = *socii*, "partners." So also Rendall, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The chief argument against this view is drawn from the fact that the noun and the corresponding verb are used in the epistle mainly in reference to things as expressing participation in them (ii. 14, iii. 1, v. 13, vii. 13, xii. 8; the things participated in being "flesh and blood," a "heavenly calling," "milk," "another tribe," "chastisement"). Chap. vi. 4 is hardly an exception, as the "Holy Spirit" is referred to impersonally as an influence. But the fact remains that in iii. 14 we have an exception of the same kind as in i. 9, and referring to the same subject, the Messiah, and it is natural to deal with both in the same way. That i. 9 is a quotation is immaterial, except indeed as creating a desire to know who in the view of the writer the μέτοχοι of Messiah referred to in the quotation are.

² *Texte und Untersuchungen*, ii. Band, Heft 3. *Die Offenbarung Johannis eine Jüdische Apokalypse in Christlicher Bearbeitung* von E. Vischer. 1886. The theory was discussed by Mr. Simcox in *THE EXPOSITOR*, 3rd series, vol. v., p. 425 f.

has thus used in reference to what has been commonly considered the earliest of St. John's writings, I have ventured to apply it to the earliest of St. Paul's epistles, and to follow as far as possible the lines of his dissertation. It seems best, in assuming the character of a destructive critic, to write with as much force and directness as possible. I have not hesitated therefore, with such an end before me, to employ arguments and to use expressions for which I desire to offer beforehand this brief explanation and apology.

I. An investigation into the origin of the Thessalonian epistles must start with the apocalyptic passage in 2 Thessalonians ii. 1-12. This touchstone will reveal the real spirit of the writer (comp. Vischer, p. 19).

The greatness of the difficulties which have to be met by those who accept the common view becomes sufficiently clear (comp. Vischer, p. 22 f), when we compare the view of Bishop Lightfoot with that of Prof. Warfield (*EXPOSITOR*, 3rd series, vol. iv., p. 40). The former (*Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, Art., *Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*) asserts "that it is on the whole probable that the antichrist is represented especially by Judaism. . . . Corresponding to this view of the antichrist, we shall probably be correct in regarding the Roman empire as the restraining power." With the latter scholar this interpretation is exactly reversed. "We cannot go far wrong," writes Professor Warfield, "in identifying him [the Man of Sin] with the Roman emperor. . . . The restraining power, on this hypothesis, appears to be the Jewish state." In such a quagmire of contradictions does the conservative school find itself.

But if we suppose the writer to be a Jew at Jerusalem, the perplexities vanish.

There are but two interpolated Christian phrases which must be removed; *viz.* ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, in ver. 1, and the doubtful Ἰησοῦς of ver. 8.

The main thought therefore of the passage seems to be this: the day of the Lord—an Old Testament phrase—will come, when once the new heresy of Christianity has reached its head; then it will be completely swept away by Jehovah's mere Presence. The following points demand notice: (1) ἡ ἀποστασία (ver. 3). Christianity would appear to a Jew at Jerusalem simply as a defection from the national faith; ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μωυσέως (Acts xxi. 21) was the charge brought against St. Paul. (2) ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας (ver. 3), τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας (ver. 7), ὁ ἄνομος (ver. 8). The emphatic repetition of the idea of lawlessness will be noticed. Treachery towards the law was the great accusation urged against the earliest Christians by the Jews (comp. Acts vi. 13, xxi. 28). The conjecture might be hazarded that in the phrase ὁ ἄνομος the Jewish writer confuses the Divine Author of Christianity Himself with St. Paul, its chief missionary.

“One called Paulus; we have heard his fame.
Indeed, if Christus be not one with him—
I know not, nor am troubled much to know.”

(3) Ver. 4 may, on this hypothesis, be considered to point to the Divine honours paid by the Christians to our Lord. With the reference to the Holy Place compare Matthew xxvi. 61; Acts vi. 13, xxi. 28. (4) In ver. 9 there is a distinct reference to the miracles which accompanied the earliest preaching of the Gospel. Further, in κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ the old charge is revived, “By Beelzebub the prince of the devils casteth He out devils” (Luke xi. 15). (5) The writer of the letter had explained to his friends when with them (ver. 5) the nature of the Roman tyranny. This foreign oppression (τὸ κατέχον) in the person of the Roman governor at Jerusalem (ὁ κατέχων) held down the natural tendencies of Jews and Christians alike. But the writer as a loyal Jew looks forward with confident hope

to the time when this alien yoke shall be removed, though naturally he uses cautious language (ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται) to express his expectation. Then at last Christianity will be seen in its true light. The final conflict between Christianity and Judaism will be fought out, and the coming of the Lord will quickly annihilate these new pretenders.

Such an interpretation of the cardinal passage of the Thessalonian epistles seems clear, self-consistent, and free from the difficulties which beset any interpretation suggested by those who uphold the Christian authorship of the whole of these epistles.

II. We next attempt to separate the interpolations of the Christian *Überarbeiter* (comp. Vischer, pp. 33-76). These are of three kinds.

1. The name *Jesus Christ*, or its equivalent, is inserted in addition to, or in place of, the name of God.

The phrase לִפְנֵי יְהוָה is one of very constant occurrence in the Old Testament. It is natural that a Jewish writer should dwell on the thought, and our author recurs to it four times in the first epistle (i. 3; ii. 19; iii. 9, 13). In the second of these passages, the Christian interpolator has added the words printed within brackets: ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Κυρίου [ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ]. In the remaining three places he has allowed the reference to God the Father to remain undisturbed (comp. Vischer, p. 60f.). Comp. 1 Thessalonians ii. 6, 10.

The presumption that the name of Christ is added in these passages by a later hand is strangely confirmed when we compare the two passages which follow, where the interpolator, after inserting the name of the Lord, has forgotten to alter the singular verb. The interpolated words are printed in brackets.

1 Thessalonians iii. 11, 12: Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν [καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς], κατευθύναί τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ Κύριος πλεονάσαι κ.τ.λ.

2 Thessalonians ii. 16: *Αὐτὸς δὲ [ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, καὶ] ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, . . . παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας καὶ στηρίξαι κ.τ.λ.*

The interpolator, it will be noticed, has manipulated the two passages in different ways. Both sentences however, when the interpolated words have been eliminated, are seen to be formed on the same model; and this type of sentence is proved to be characteristic of the original writer when the following passages are compared: 1 Thessalonians v. 23, *Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγιάσαι ὑμᾶς*: 2 Thessalonians iii. 5, *Ὁ δὲ Κύριος κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας*: iii. 16, *Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης δοῇ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰρήνην* (comp. Vischer, pp. 18, 37, 42).

Some of the other interpolated words which come under this head must be briefly mentioned. Thus in the first epistle (a) i. 3, omit *τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The strain of the piled up genitives is thus relieved. (b) i. 10, *υἱόν* may have been substituted for *Χριστόν*, and the words *ὃν ἡγείρεν . . . Ἰησοῦν* were inserted. (c) iv. 14 should be omitted. Thus the awkwardness of two consecutive clauses beginning with *γάρ* is avoided. (d) iv. 16: if *ἐν Χριστῷ* be omitted, the antithesis between *οἱ νεκροί* and *οἱ ζῶντες* is clearly maintained. (e) Further, it is remarkable that in one passage (2 Thess. ii. 8) the critical attestation seems to betray a sense of the precariousness of the insertion.

2. The salutations and personal allusions are obviously the additions of a later hand, if this hypothesis be accepted on other grounds, and can easily be removed. How far however there may be incorporated in these passages fragments of the original, it is impossible now to form an opinion (comp. Vischer, p. 34). Thus in 1 Thessalonians ii. 14, it is probable enough that the original Jewish writer drew a parallel between the sufferings of his friends in Thessalonica (if we assume that this was the destination of the letters in their original (Jewish) form), and those of his fellow

countrymen in Judæa. Both were the victims of the Gentiles, on whom the Divine vengeance would shortly fall.

3. Certain Christian, and especially Pauline, phrases and words may be eliminated, and the context remain unharmed, if it be not improved (comp. Vischer, pp. 36, 68).

The interpolator, for example, wishes to give a Pauline tinge to the epistles by inserting references to *πίστις*, *ἐλπίς*, *ἀγάπη*, though it was not till a period later than the supposed date of these epistles that St. Paul formulated the great triad of Christian graces. Thus in 1 Thessalonians i. 3, the Pauline graces must needs have a conspicuous position given them in the forefront of the epistle. If they are eliminated from the passage, it gains clearly in simplicity of construction and in point (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 9, *τὸν κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον*).

A still clearer case is 1 Thessalonians v. 8. The passage is in fact a quotation from Isaiah lix. 17. In the second of the two clauses, if *ἐλπίδα* be omitted, the exact phrase of the LXX. (except for the insignificant alteration of *σωτηρίου* into *σωτηρίας*) is given. But *ἐλπίς* having been inserted, it became necessary to find a place for *πίστις* and *ἀγάπη*. The breastplate therefore, which in Isaiah answers to "righteousness," is incorrectly described as made up of two materials, and the metaphor becomes confused.

Again, it is clear from their position that the words *καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου* in 1 Thessalonians i. 6 are an addition. They do not harmonize with the defining words which follow, *δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον κ.τ.λ.*

The excision of other phrases as Christian will readily suggest itself. I have only dwelt on two typical cases.

III. It remains to show the Jewish character of what is left when the interpolations have been removed (comp. Vischer, pp. 76-91).

1. We notice how in the original portion the writer speaks of God the Father, when a Christian would naturally

have referred to Christ. Thus it is not *ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ* (1 Cor. i. 18) which is gaining ground, but *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, λόγος ἀκοῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Again, it is not to a belief in a Redeemer that the heathen have turned, but *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, . . . δουλεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ* (comp. Vischer, pp. 72, 86).

2. The sternness of some passages is very remarkable. Not the salvation, but the punishment, of those who stand outside the circle of safety is the object of deep desire. What words could be fuller of a passionate craving for vengeance than 2 Thessalonians i. 6-10 and ii. 1-12 (comp. Vischer, pp. 55, 82) ?

3. The advice of St. Paul to an inquiring heathen, as recorded in the Acts (xvi. 31) was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Here however all stress is laid on such moral duties as occupied the thoughts of Old Testament prophets. The will of God is described as being chiefly abstinence from fornication and from meddling in magic (2 Thess. iii. 11 *περιεργαζομένους*: comp. Acts xix. 13, 19 *τῶν περιερχομένων Ἰουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν . . . τῶν τὰ περίεργα πραξάντων*), kindness of man to man, and honest labour.

4. No reader of the Gospels can forget the strength of the Lord's denunciation of those who "held fast the tradition of men" (Mark vii. 8). It is echoed by St. Paul at two different periods of his life (Gal. i. 14, Col. ii. 8). If the writer had been a Christian, would he twice over have spoken of "the keeping the traditions" as the main guarantee for stability in right living (2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6) ?

Thus I have stated an hypothesis in regard to the two epistles which form the earliest group of St. Paul's writings, and I have supported it with arguments of considerable weight, I believe, from a critical point of view.

I do not accept the theory myself, nor have I the slightest

fear lest any one else should become enamoured with it. But I do not think that its discussion is purposeless. Vischer's theory in regard to the composition of the Apocalypse is wonderfully ingenious, and seems to offer the explanation of many difficulties. I do not pretend to have dealt with it as a whole. I cannot however but think that the application of the same critical method to another portion of the New Testament brings to light several important points.

1. If such an hypothesis can be maintained with any show of reason in regard to a letter, which, from its nature, vividly reflects the mind of its writer, and is one of a large collection of his letters, we need not be surprised that a similar theory can be made very plausible in the case of the Apocalypse, a much more artificial work, if the word may be allowed, and one which is largely founded in regard of both its imagery and its language on the Old Testament.

2. "Knowledge grows from more to more." The associations of Judaism may perhaps have clung more than we commonly suppose even to the Apostles, and especially in their earliest works may have influenced their conceptions and their phraseology. If this was the case with the "fusile Apostle," "the Apostle of the Gentiles," how much more should we expect it to be so with St. John, one of "the Three," who deliberately chose "the circumcision" as the sphere of his work (Gal. ii. 9)?

3. Parallels to some of the more striking phenomena in the Apocalypse pointed out by Vischer have been adduced.

4. It has been shown that the adoption of such a theory may happen to have the appearance of throwing an altogether unexpected light on a passage, the interpretation of which has always presented most difficult problems to Christian scholars.

FRED. H. CHASE.

THE GROUP OF THE APOSTLES.

II. PETER.

WE have seen how consistent and lifelike are the various incidents recorded of the group of the apostles, and how matter of fact and unidealized is the conception of them. And since the story of our Lord is supported by exactly the same evidence, we have concluded that what verifies the former is a testimony to the latter as well.

We now turn to those individuals among the Twelve concerning whom enough is recorded to give them shape and colour; and we ask how it stands with them. Are they real persons, or demigods, or shadows? And where we can find incidents related of them by more than one evangelist, do these incidents harmonize?

For it is quite certain that if the historians have given any rein whatever to their fancy, they will have been carried in very different directions. The Socrates of Plato and of Xenophon, the Cyrus of three narrators, the Cæsar of Plutarch and of Shakespeare, are sufficiently unlike to establish this proposition. Where a real life is honestly and accurately depicted there will yet be variety, because each author will be impressed by traits congenial to his own character; and this is the reason why our idea of Jesus is formed of contributions from four sources. But these varieties will blend, like the colours in a beam of light, into one harmonious effect.

Foremost of the Twelve, not only in station but also in force and vigour of delineation, is Simon the son of Jonas, to whose whole life that may be applied which is written of the sins of some, that it goes before him unto judgment, so clear and transparent is the import of all the record, so unequivocal for good or evil.

What image does our mind call up at the name of the greatest of the apostles? We think of a man in middle life, of whom it may be said equally, "When thou wast young" and "when thou shalt be old," and whose wife's mother retains sufficient vigour, when relieved from illness, to arise and minister to his guests (John xxi. 18; Matt. viii. 15). A weatherbeaten man, not unused to whole nights of toil and to wrestling with the whirlwinds that rage upon the Lake of Galilee (Luke v. 5; John vi. 18). A hasty man, who first quits the ship and then observes how wild the waves are, who rashly answers for the payment of tribute by his master, who strikes with the sword while others crave directions,¹ and who plunges into the waters rather than await the slow movement of a ship which drags a heavy net (Matt. xiv. 30, xvii. 24; Luke xxii. 49; Matt. xxvi. 51; John xxi. 7). A helpful man, the one who draws that same net ashore when all are bidden to bring of the fish which they have caught, and whose ship, rather than another, Jesus will choose to enter when He would fain be removed a little from the throng (John xxi. 11; Luke v. 3). By no means a penniless labourer for hire, but one of a company who possessed two ships,² and, besides the five partners, employed hired servants enough to carry on the trade when four of its members were withdrawn (Luke v. 1-11; Mark i. 20). An unlearned and ignorant man, according to the standard of technical acquirement at Jerusalem; yet not unable to address Cornelius in Greek, and (unless he employed a secretary) to correspond with his Churches in epistles very fairly worded (Acts iv. 13, x.). An affectionate man, sharing his house, although married, with his brother Andrew, and also with his wife's mother, for whom not

¹ Lange has missed a point for once, by making it Peter who asks for orders. *Life of Christ*, Clarke's translation, iii. 226.

² Probably not more, since their partners were summoned to help from "the other ship," not merely from another.

only he but all the group besought Jesus; one whose wife was content, a little later, to go with him in the labours of his apostolic wanderings; who could make to his Master the pathetic appeal, "Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee" (Mark i. 29; Luke iv. 38; 1 Cor. ix. 5; John xxi. 17). For, in truth, a reproachful glance from that beloved One had almost broken his heart. A genial, simple, and unsuspecting nature, outspoken rather than profound, the first to be led to Jesus by a disciple already won, and the easiest to bring; capable of a great fall, but quick to obtain the relief of tears, and already sufficiently recovered to hasten to the sepulchre upon the first tidings of a further change (John i. 41; Matt. xxvi. 75; John xx. 3). A rough man, betraying his province by his dialect, and liable to relapse, in a moment of great pressure and peril, into the coarse language of the market (Matt. xxvi. 74). A man who was quickly rather than delicately sensitive; for when John would not intrude upon his Master, then troubled in spirit, by searching out the traitor, Peter had no sympathy with such a fine reserve, but beckoned to him to ask the question; whereupon it was the immediate task of the Divine tact of Jesus to remove Judas from the room (John xiii. 24). Peter himself was quite ready to repay in kind the service thus rendered him by John; for the fourth gospel pointedly connects this incident with the fact that Peter, when his risen Master had drawn him aside, seeing John modestly and unobtrusively following, called attention to the silent one by asking, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" (John xxi. 20, 21.) Perhaps there is not in the gospels a more characteristic phrase, so generous in its desire to introduce the wistful brother into the discourse, so wilful in its assumption that Jesus was overlooking "this man," so prosaic, even to shallowness, in its failure to be duly impressed and solemnized by the withdrawal of the veil from his own future and by the

stern prospect revealed. Is it conceivable that St. John should have made such an answer to such a warning, or even that he should have "turned about" at all to see who followed? This was the point of our Lord's rebuke in answer: Peter had nothing at such a time to do with others; let him see that his own heart was strong. Once he had asked, "Why cannot I follow Thee now?" and had since found by sore experience that he was still unready to follow Jesus. Now he is reminded that the same task still lies before him, and should have the first place in his mind. The days are past when he might go whither he would: henceforth he is in the hands of stronger and overmastering forces; and yet he may be free in the midst of coercions, if only it is his will to follow Jesus, the Cross-bearer.

Such was he to whom the keys were given, and to whom Jesus especially committed the task of strengthening his brethren. Yet one can easily conceive a more elevated character than his. St. John was probably a greater man, assuredly a greater thinker, his insight more penetrating, his mental grasp more powerful. But the greatness of the sage, and even of the man, is one thing, and the special greatness of the apostle is quite another thing. The question was not of inventing a religion, like Mohammad or the Buddha; nor of elaborating a theology, like Calvin or Augustine; nor even of working out, like St. Paul, the problem of its relations to the Gentile world. What is required is a mind upon which a few great conceptions could be strongly stamped, a heart which would respond with ardour to the appeal of love and loveliness in wholly novel manifestations, and a life which might often err, it is true, but was capable of a great surrender and a genuine loyalty, and frank, warm, and outspoken enough to convey its emotions vigorously to other men. The world would not

be converted (though the Church once founded might be edified exceedingly) by deep and silent reveries and profound views of truth. Not a sage but an interpreter was needed. And it will appear that while Peter and John were constantly together, in every case the initiative was taken by the first.

Let us now see how this conception of a simple and loyal soul, easily impressed, ready to express itself, and well fitted to spread the contagion of its ardour, is worked out by the different evangelists in detail.

When first we come upon him, he is one of a circle in which the Baptist has inspired the highest hope, and Andrew needs only to tell him, "We have found the Messiah," in order to bring him to Jesus. With him the Divine wisdom at once takes the initiative, and reading his character announces that "thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone," a mass from the living Rock. What is said of him is not, as presently of Nathanael, what he already was; on the contrary, Jesus (who is now acting, for the first time, as only Jehovah does in the Old Testament) bestows a new name which will best express the especial blessing in store for the want of Simon. And he gives Peter no opportunity for a rash utterance, but looks him through and promptly speaks a strong word, fitted to burn deep into a sensitive heart (John i. 42).

His quick impressibility appeared, in different ways, at the first miraculous draught of fish, when he prostrated himself, and cried "Depart from me," and when, with a shudder, he said, "This shall never be unto Thee," "minding" things in their earthly aspect, but with only too vivid apprehension (Luke v. 8; Matt. xvi. 22). So, too; the waves, in his strange position as he walked on them to Jesus, and our Lord's surrender to His foes, and the hostile crowd in the palace, and long afterwards the frown of his compatriots

from Jerusalem, whose displeasure while distant he had defied, all came home to his keen susceptibilities with perilous and misleading power (Matt. xiv. 30; Luke xxii. 53; Mark xiv. 66; Gal. ii. 12).

Closer observation will detect, beside this well known impetuosity in action, a restless craving to act, an inability to "be still and see salvation," in every crisis a feeling that he must do something, even if he can discover no deed fitting the occasion. There was in him a certain absence of repose, which involved him in many of his troubles, yet indicated zeal and self-reliance.

Upon the Mount of Transfiguration we are surprised to learn what followed because he knew not what to say. Silence one would expect, but it is not so; it is the strange proposal to build three booths in which the transfigured Lord and His visitants from another world may enjoy separate accommodation and shelter from the night air, since it was good to be there.¹ In answer to this bewildered proposal, which sets the three upon a level, the voice from heaven bids them continue to hear Jesus, as they have done for years, and He alone is left with them (Mark ix. 5).

But this, though an extreme example, is not at all a solitary one. It is not enough to await Jesus in the ship; he desires to meet Him half-way, upon the water; he must remonstrate if Christ's forebodings appear too gloomy; he wants to know, "Why cannot I follow Thee now?" he must needs smite unbidden; and while awaiting new revelations he will go a-fishing (Matt. xiv. 28; Mark viii. 32; John xiii. 37, xviii. 10, xxi. 3).

There is always a similar plunge, one might say, into the water, into unweighed words, into conflict, and into the stronghold of his foes. And in every case he is quite willing to act alone. This is the peculiarity which Jesus

¹ In several manuscripts Peter proposes that he should himself build all three tabernacles.

indicated, with a wonderfully accurate and delicate touch, in the words, When thou wast young, thou didst go, with loins girt, in the ways of thine own will (John xxi. 18).

Such quick feelings and impulsive ardour are the natural companions of a quality, dangerous enough, but absolutely necessary for his high calling, the great readiness of speech, of which several examples have been already quoted. His impulsive utterances did often outrun his judgment and become blameworthy, but they were almost always heightened and lovable.

It is worth notice, that while he is so commonly the speaker for the group, we do not once read of his being so for evil. The rebuke of those who sought to have their children blessed, and of one who cast out devils without following the apostles, the imputing of sin to "this man or his parents," the impatience excited by the clamour of the woman of Canaan, the intrigue for the right-hand and left-hand places in the kingdom, the proposal to call down fire on the Samaritans, and the complaint of the waste of ointment, in no gospel is one of these ascribed to Peter (Mark x. 13; Luke ix. 49; John ix. 2; Matt. xv. 23; Mark x. 37; Luke ix. 54; Matt. xxvi. 8).

And if we reckon up the various occasions of his stumbling, none of them will be traced to meanness or self-indulgence at the root. If he left the ship, it was to go to Jesus; if he dared to rebuke the Lord, it was because the prospect of His suffering shocked him; he would vouch for the payment by his Master of any claim which he deemed just; if his estimate of the duty of forgiveness fell short of the New Testament standard, it excelled that of his nation; he would not suffer his Lord to perform for him a menial office, but when he discerned its deeper meaning, he asked too much, forgetting that he was "bathed" already; he could not believe that any form of peril would shake his

fidelity to Christ, for whom he was indeed prepared to fight, whose surrender only he failed to share; if he slept in the garden, it was "for sorrow"; and if in the palace he was finally overcome, it was because, with nerves unstrung, he yet ventured farther than any, except one who had interest in the place (Matt. xiv. 29, xvi. 22, xvii. 24, xviii. 21; John xiii. 8; Mark xiv. 31; Luke xxii. 45; John xviii. 16).

We come nearer to the secret of his greatness when we observe that his sensibilities were not more alive to anything than to spiritual impressions. It was he who "called to mind" that the blighted fig tree was that which the Master cursed (Mark xi. 21). When his nets broke, he felt neither that a great spoil was given to him, nor yet that the marvel of the giving was greater than the gift; all thought of wonder and of gain was lost in the overwhelming sense of his own unworthiness of such a presence: and although it was not for him to shake off the mighty influence which had come into his life, yet he dared not accept it without the confession, the almost protest, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord."

Thus Job, when he saw God, abhorred himself and repented; and thus Isaiah cried out, "Woe is me, for I am undone." Self-abasement, not presumptuous confidence, restored the patriarch, and gave Isaiah and Peter their commission (Luke v. 8; Job xlii. 6; Isa. vi. 5).

When Jesus asked the Twelve, "Will ye also go away?" it was Peter who answered, acting, perhaps for the first time, as the authorized spokesman of all the company. He did not speak of the marvellous miracle they had witnessed; rather was his heart still vibrating with the great utterance which had offended many, and therefore he said, "Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God." And since men who had learned the message of eternity could not return

to their nets, nor choose but follow some spiritual chief, he asked, "Lord, to whom should we go?" (John vi. 68.)

Again, when Jesus asked, "Who say men that I am?" all were ready to declare how some said with Herod that He was the Baptist, some Elias the forerunner, some (because Jesus had now begun to foretell a new ruin of Jerusalem) the melancholy Jeremiah, and others vaguely one of the old prophets. But when Jesus again asked, "Who say ye that I am?" Peter alone gave the clear and decisive answer; not, as with the qualifying preface used of the guesses of the people, "we say," but confidently, as one might hail his king, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. xvi. 13-17).

Blessed in that hour was Simon Bar-Jonas, and now Christ declared to him that he was actually Peter; because this truth was not revealed to him by flesh and blood, not even by the lips of Jesus, but by the voice of the Father, heard in the silence of a consecrated heart. Not that he was himself the rock, for against his gratified self-confidence the gates of hell too quickly began to prevail, and the words which he next pronounced fell upon the Saviour's ear as the very utterance of the evil one. But the great confession he had made was the foundation and basis of the Christian faith; and therefore it was given to him to open the gates of the spiritual kingdom, alike to Jews upon the day of Pentecost, and to Gentiles by the baptism of Cornelius.

It is entirely in accordance with all the character we have been examining, that an appealing glance, and the occurrence of a trivial but predicted event should suffice to arrest his fall, and from wild and recreant oaths convert him to the weeping of bitter tears (Luke xxii. 60, 61).

And it is to be observed that, while the Searcher of hearts knew the special danger of censoriousness and uncharity in the hour of one's own pardon, and expressed it in the parable of a debtor, forgiven much, who straightway, be-

ginning to economise, took by the throat his own debtor of a hundred pence, yet He had no fears of this kind for Peter, but looked to him, when restored, to restore the rest, who should also have forsaken their Lord and fled. Such is the only sufficient meaning of the words which warn Peter, calling him for his greater admonition by the old name of his secular life, "Simon, Simon, Satan asked to have you (*all*), that he might sift you as wheat; but I made prayer for thee (*in particular*), that thy faith fail not: and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren" (Luke xxii. 31, 32).

This was his especial function. And yet John was more faithful; he did not deny Christ in the judgment hall, he watched by Him at the cross. But John's nature was pensive, retiring, passive, better suited to fathom the mystery of the eternal Word, than to take the helm in a tempest.

This leads us to consider the remarkable relation which exists between the silent disciple, who received the tender charge of Mary, and him whose sinewy hands were fitter to grasp the ponderous keys of the kingdom than to wipe a woman's tears.

It is not very hazardous to infer that Peter and John were linked when Jesus sent forth His apostles two by two.

We have already seen that each sub-division of four apostles is the same in every list of the Twelve; and this represents, almost certainly, a fixed arrangement. In that case we may safely assert that each group contained two of those couples whom our Lord saw fit to join together; for the same reasons, whether of mutual attraction or of character which once yoked them together, would oppose the rupture of the tie. It follows that the colleague of Peter was either Andrew or else James or John. But his brother Andrew seems most unlikely, because there would be less of stimulus in the presence of a member of his own family, and less reinforcement for his weakness in one whose

character, as will be shown hereafter, is curiously similar to his own, though less vigorously developed. What is desirable in such a case is the alliance of natures, not indeed antagonistic, but supplementary, so that, as Lord Tennyson sings of a still closer tie, each may subserve defect in each. It was thus with the friendship which that great poet has immortalized; and he has written:

“ ‘More than my brothers are to me’—
Let this not vex thee, noble heart!
I know thee of what force thou art
To hold the costliest love in fee.

But thou and I are one in kind,
As moulded like in nature’s mint;
And hill and wood and field did print
The same sweet forms on either mind.

And so my wealth resembles thine,
But he was rich when I was poor,
And he supplied my want the more
As his unlikeness fitted mine.”

It will appear in a future paper that the wealth of Andrew too much resembled Peter’s own to be chosen to supply his want.

With James Peter is never found co-operating in any special effort, although both are included with John in the inner circle, the elect of the election among the Twelve. But Peter and John were as admirably adapted to help each other as the two great heroes of the Reformation, whom they so much resembled in other ways, Luther and Melancthon.

It will therefore be a striking coincidence, and a fine example of the minute harmonies which close examination reveals throughout all the narratives, if these *à priori* considerations of probability coincide with a number of recorded facts.

Now Peter and John were sent together to find the man bearing a pitcher of water; Peter beckoned to John to ask who was the traitor; it was John who brought Peter into the palace of the high priest; Mary Magdalene, when sent to "tell Peter," found him and John together, and they ran both to the sepulchre; it was to Peter in the fishing boat that John whispered his recognition of the mysterious stranger on the shore; and Peter asked concerning John, "What shall this man do?" together they went to the temple when the lame man at the Beautiful Gate received their wondrous alms; they subsequently stood forward together when Peter made his bold defence; and they two were sent together by the apostles at Jerusalem to confirm the disciples at Samaria¹ (Luke xxii. 8; John xiii. 24, xviii. 16, xx. 2, xxi. 7, 21; Acts iii. 1, iv. 13, 19; viii. 14).

Nothing can be more consistent than all the incidents and traits which we have now compared. A glance at the references will show that they are drawn impartially from all four gospels and from the Acts of the Apostles. They are not a few convenient facts selected from a great many, for there is scarcely an incident recorded of him, and certainly not one characteristic or important incident, which has not found its place in the accumulative demonstration.

The most homely events and the most astounding miracles are equally stamped with this verifying impress—the manner of Simon Bar-Jonas, as unmistakable as the impatient style of Carlyle, or the bold touch of Michael Angelo.

And yet this rich, exuberant, and strongly drawn character is over-mastered at every point by that of Jesus, before Whom he does well to prostrate himself.

¹ It will be observed that this duty is imposed upon him after he has entered upon whatever authority may be supposed to accompany the keys. A modern Romanist is therefore bound to ask whether his bishops are in a position to order a pope upon a journey. The surprise with which he would receive such a commission is the measure of his usurpation.

Moreover, we have primitive authority for believing that St. Peter contributed the materials at least for the second gospel, which is full of just such incidents as would delight his vehement spirit. Its very keynote is the word "straightway," and everything in it breathes of the energy, penetration, decision, and fire which took the heart of Peter by storm.

But here, as elsewhere, we never once find the Master overstepping those limits of prudence and fine feeling which the disciple transgressed so often. It is indeed on this account, and by reason of the exquisite balance of all great qualities in the Messiah, that so many are surprised when bidden to observe the strength and even intensity of will and action of the

"Gentle Jesus, meek and mild."

We do not recognise the burning will, the zeal which "devoured," when we find them mellowed and sweetened by the softer graces, only not predominant when it is a duty to set them aside.

As an admirably proportioned man does not appear so large as another of equal stature, so the powers of Christ are less discerned by reason of their harmony. And therefore it is well that, like St. Margaret's Church beside Westminster Abbey, the impetuous fervour of Peter should serve as a scale by which the imagination can measure the redeeming energies which inspired, rebuked, and converted him, which faltered not when he fled, and having conquered the grave, restored to him his forfeited commission.

The Christian is at least entitled to ask the unbelieving critic: How can the authenticity of this strong and graphic conception be denied? yet how can it be accepted without conceding the miraculous narrative and all the claims of Christ?

G. A. CHADWICK.

THE PRIESTHOOD AND PRIESTLY SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

FROM the Head of the Church we turn to the Church herself. The living Lord is now a Priest in heaven. How far is His Church on earth priestly? and, if she is so, what are the functions in which her priestliness is fulfilled? The inquiry must relate in the first instance to the Church as a whole, and not to any particular class within her. Upon the propriety of keeping this in view, it is unnecessary to say more than has been said already.

There can be no hesitation then in asserting that, in the strictest and fullest meaning of the words, the Church of Christ is a sacerdotal or priestly institution. Sacerdotalism, priestliness, is the prime element of her being; and it is so because it is the prime element in the being of her exalted and glorified Head. The general principle from which we must start in all inquiries of this kind is, that whatever function Christ discharges in heaven must also be discharged, according to her capabilities and opportunities, by His Church on earth. This principle is the simple corollary to the fundamental principle of the Church's existence as a spiritual body, that she is the Body of Christ, and that the Body lives in such close communion with the Head, that whatever the latter is or does the former must in measure be or do. "I am the Vine, ye are the branches" (John xv. 5); such is the declaration by her Lord of the Church's privilege and standing among men. "Abide in Me, and I in you" (John xv. 4) is His authoritative command. The true idea of the Church on earth is not that she consists of a vast multitude of men, individually following in the footsteps of their Master, and looking for ever-increasing measures of the Spirit dispensed by Him from heaven. Nor is it even that of a Body starting from earth, and

reaching onwards to a heavenly condition, only perfectly attained when our present mortal pilgrimage is over. It is rather the idea of a Body starting from heaven, and exhibiting the graces and privileges already ideally bestowed upon it in such a manner as may lead the world either to come to the light, or to condemn itself because it loves darkness rather than light, its deeds being evil. The visibility of the Body is one of the essential notes of its existence. The Father of the spirits of all flesh desires to make Himself known for the salvation of the world. Before this can be effectually done, He must, according to the constitution of our nature, be seen in what He is. Therefore, because no man hath seen or can see God at any time, the Only Begotten, which was in the bosom of the Father, hath "declared" Him (John i. 18). This "declaration," however, could be made by Christ Himself to none but the men of His own generation. A record of it might be preserved; books might be written regarding it; a full and detailed description of what Jesus was while upon earth might be given to mankind. But not in books alone could all that is involved in communion with the Father be so presented to the world as to attract it also into that blessed fellowship. The world needed to see what such fellowship implied, how it elevated and consecrated and beautified human life, and, in the only sense in which the word ought to be used, brought "salvation" to man. Hence, accordingly, the words of our Lord Himself, "As Thou didst send Me into the world, even so sent I them into the world"; "And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given unto them; that they may be one even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them, even as Thou lovedst Me" (John xvii. 18, 22, 23). Hence, the words of "the disciple whom Jesus loved," "If we walk in

the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 7). And hence, even more particularly, those words of the same apostle which hardly appear as yet to have received the due consideration of the Church, "As He *is*, even so are we in this world" (1 John iv. 17). Further, it would seem to be a principle involved in the revelation of the New Testament, and confirmed by the analogy of nature, that the Head of the Church acts only through the Body; and that, if the world is to be made partaker of the influences of His Spirit, that Spirit shall be conferred through the instrumentality of men, through the instrumentality of those of whom, it may be said that, when the world receives them, it receives Christ Himself and Him that sent Him (John xiii. 20).

It follows from all this, that whatever Christ is or does in heaven must be represented or done by the Church on earth. No doubt it will be done imperfectly. The Church has not yet realized the ideal perfection which belongs to her. Sin too often prevails where there ought to be no sin; there is disunion where there ought to be unity; there is weakness where there ought to be strength; and, however high their spiritual life, the members of the Church must always be clothed with their body of humiliation, with their body of flesh, until He who is now waited for comes again and fashions it anew, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things unto Himself (Phil. iii. 20, 21).

Notwithstanding this, the Church's ideal state supplies even now the standard of her duty; it is the manifestation of that state which she is to have ever before her eyes; and to draw nearer and nearer to it is to be her constant effort. From Him in whom her ideal is already actually realized she draws her measure of that state to the extent

to which she is able to receive it. The stream of which she is to drink, and which she is to convey to others, does not show simply the amount of water stored in any small spring opened on the mountain side, but rather the abounding fulness of that great gathering of waters above the firmament, upon which more truly than upon the ocean the words may be written, "dread, fathomless, alone." These waters the Church, with her varied ordinances of grace, is to transmit, as she passes onwards to the future, in ever-increasing volume for the fertilization of widening lands and the refreshment of multiplying peoples. The true conception of the Church, in short, is that she begins in heaven and descends with all her powers to earth: she does not begin on earth and work her way to heaven.

Whatever function then is discharged by Christ in heaven must also be discharged by His Church on earth. Is the glorified Redeemer a Prophet?—the prophetic office must belong to her. It may be in a form distributed through appropriate members; but primarily it belongs to her as a whole, the life of Christ in His prophetic office being first *her* life, and then *her* life pervading and animating any particular persons through whom the functions of the prophetic life are discharged. In like manner, is the glorified Redeemer a King (into the special nature of this kingship we cannot inquire at present)?—the kingly office must also belong to her; and, if it again is to be represented in any particular members rather than in the Body as a whole, her life must penetrate and pervade these members so that they may be kingly. If it be so with Christ's offices as Prophet and King, it cannot be less so with that priestly office which is the culminating part of all His work, the foundation upon which the others rest, and the fountain out of which they flow.

Nothing accordingly can be more distinct than the manner in which this priestly character of the Church is

set before us in Scripture. We have already had occasion to speak of the priestly character of Israel; and we have seen that, if that central aspect of the people of God under the Old Testament dispensation is to be fulfilled under the New Testament, it must, after the analogy of all else, be fulfilled in Christ, and then in His Church. We have referred also to the plain statement of the Apostle Peter on the point. Yet it may be worth while to note the same fact in connexion with that Melchizedek aspect of our Lord's priesthood which especially distinguishes it in heaven. Wherever the priestly character of the Church's Head in heaven is treated of, there the priestly character of His people upon earth appears. Thus in Psalm cx., where the coming Redeemer is saluted as "a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," those that stand by Him in the war are described as offering themselves willingly "in the beauties of holiness," or "in holy attire." "The holy garments are priestly garments. They who wear them are priestly warriors in the train of a priestly leader."¹

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, again, the sacred writer has no sooner set forth the glory of the Melchizedek priesthood, and of Jesus as a High Priest after that order, than he makes the practical application: "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place in the blood of Jesus, by the way which He dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh; and having a great Priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart, in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water" (chap. x. 19-22). The entering "into the holy place," spoken of in these words, at once suggests the light under which Christians are there thought of, for into it, under the Old Testament economy, priests alone could enter; and this conclusion

¹ Perowne, *in loc.*

is strengthened by the fact, that the two participial sentences, marking out the mode in which we are to draw near, are grounded, the one on the sprinkling of blood which accompanied the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood (Exod. xxix. 21); the other on the command that when they entered into the tabernacle of the congregation they should wash with water, that they died not (Exod. xxx. 20). It is as priests then that members of the Christian Church enjoy their privilege of immediate access to the presence of God. Because they have a High Priest over the house of God, they are priests in Him.

The same thing appears once more in the Revelation of St. John. That in the visions of that apostle, Christ exalted in glory is the High Priest of His Church, no one can for a moment doubt. It is the truth embodied in the fundamental vision of the book, that of one "like unto a Son of man" in chap. i. In that vision Jesus may also be a King, but He is certainly first a Priest, in priestly garments worn as these were worn by the priests of Israel when engaged in active work. With equal clearness does St. John teach us in the same book that in the risen and glorified High Priest all His people are also priests. They have been made "to be a kingdom, to be priests unto His God and Father" (chap. i. 6); and the white robes which they wear on all occasions throughout the book are robes of priests.

It is unnecessary to enlarge upon this point; for, the Head being a priest, the mystical union between it and the members involves in their case the same idea. Few indeed deny what is here contended for. What is needed is not so much a wider acceptance of the truth, as a deeper and livelier appreciation of its power and consequences. We may start with this as an indisputable fact, that the chief characteristic of the glorified Redeemer being His heavenly

priesthood, a priesthood moulded upon His, and exhibiting it to the world, is the chief characteristic of His Church. What, we have rather to ask, is in this respect the Church's commission in the world? It must correspond to that of the Head.

I. The Church has an offering to present to God. After what has been said of the offering of our Lord, we can have little difficulty in determining what this offering is. We have seen that the offering of our Lord is not a mere memorial of His death, but that it is rather His life, won through that death, in a full, one, everlasting, and never to be repeated sacrifice and offering to the Father. The Church again is in Him, and He is in her; and what therefore she presents is her life in His life, obediently and submissively devoted in perpetual service to the will of His Father and her Father, of His God, and her God. Constrained by the mercies of God, she is to present herself, in body as well as spirit, a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is her reasonable or spiritual service (Rom. xii. 1). In the joyful confidence of love she is to draw near continually, with full assurance of faith, into the inmost sanctuary of the Divine presence, and there to obtain fresh quickening for the duties that would otherwise be too difficult for her, and for the temptations that she would be otherwise unable to overcome. The life of the Church, even in this world, ought to be at once a life of consecration and of joy. Thus it was that our Lord spoke of it as the great end of His own consecration, that His Church "might be consecrated in truth" (John xvii. 19); that is, in a manner real, spiritual, everlasting, the counterpart of that in which He is consecrated. And thus it was that He prayed that His people might have His "joy fulfilled in themselves" (John xvii. 13),—His own deep, abiding joy, because He stood in the Father's name; because His work, amidst all its sorrows,

was in them and through them a joyful work; and because He was the constant recipient of the Father's joy. It is because she is priestly that the offering by the Church of herself to God is so unconstrained and free. Why is "the spirit of bondage again unto fear" so common among us, instead of the "spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father"? Why do so many fail to say, "His commandments are not grievous," "His yoke is easy, and His burden is light?" It is because they do not sufficiently recognise the fact that, in their great High Priest sitting on or standing by the throne, they are priests. Did they feel that they were so, they would see that it was the very essence of their position to draw near to God with confidence, and to lay their bodies, souls, and spirits upon His altar, assured that they were an acceptable offering to Him.

So far as we have come no objection will probably be taken to anything that has been said. But a most important point now meets us, on which there may be more difference of opinion. The point seems to have been hardly enough discussed in the Church; and what is to be said ought to be regarded as rather suggesting inquiry, than as indicating positive or dogmatic conclusions.

The principle upon which we have been proceeding, it will be remembered, is, that the offering of the Church on earth is the counterpart of her Lord's offering of Himself in heaven. In this offering, however, our Lord does not simply surrender Himself to God in a life, if we may so speak, of *individual* freedom and joy. He surrenders Himself for others. He does not stand alone; and the question thus forces itself upon us, Is there anything in the offering made on the part of the Church on earth in her priestly functions that corresponds to this?

Let us glance again for a moment at our Lord's heavenly offering, in the light in which we have been led mainly to consider it. In heaven He always presents Himself to the

Father in His perfect, one, and everlasting offering for the redemption of the world. There He also presents in Himself, as an acceptable offering or sacrifice to God, all who in the exercise of appropriating faith are enabled by Divine grace to make themselves one with Him. In other words, our Lord being now in heaven, and being there not less truly human than Divine, carries out in its complete perfection the life of God in human nature; while at the same time, taking His people into union with Himself, He makes those who from the first moment of faith are ideally His to be more and more actually His, so that the Father may behold in them what He beholds in Him. It is impossible however that this should be accomplished by a merely legal act. Christ's people must be offered, and they must freely offer themselves in Him, with a true, personal appropriation on their part of such a sacrifice as He made, of such labours and sufferings as He endured, of such a death as that through which He passed. Now of this sacrifice, of these labours and sufferings, of this death on our Lord's part, the idea of enduring them for others is an essential element; and there must therefore be some sense in which a similar thought has a place assigned to it in our conception of offering on the Church's part. Without this, indeed, offering would fail to accomplish its great end, alike as regards Christians themselves, and as regards the world around them.

It would fail as regards themselves; for suffering on behalf of others, self-sacrifice for the good of others, is essential to that perfecting of the character, to that bringing it into likeness or conformity to the character of Christ, which is "salvation." Did that word mean in itself only the bestowal of pardon and everlasting happiness, or were it possible to think of the bestowal of a completed moral and religious life without disciplinary experience, it might not be so. But "salvation" always implies in Scripture delivering

us from the power of evil, "loosing us from our sins," and a re-creation within us of that Divine image which we had lost. And this again, according to the nature of man cannot be imparted without our passing experimentally through that process in which we die unto sin and live unto righteousness, in which we die to self and rise into the life of God.

Now the essence of the Divine life is love. "God is love." Love is the fundamental conception of His being. It is that boundless crystal sea which contains within it all existence and which would communicate its own blessedness to every creature. Love moreover cannot be conceived of without the thought of others to share what it has to bestow. We must therefore love others if we are to know what "salvation" means; and, in the growing and perfecting of our love to others, our salvation grows and is perfected. Further, when they to whom our love must flow forth, if we have love at all, are sinful and rebellious against the only true good; when they are ignorant of what their real welfare is; or when, so far as they are dimly conscious of it, they are inclined to resist and to reject it; when they are involved in misery that shocks our sensibilities, grieves our hearts, and threatens to baffle all our efforts for its cure; when their condition, in short, needs rectifying, and when it cannot be rectified without pain, then love must assume the form of self-sacrifice. Without this it may be a genuine pity or an empty sentimentalism, but it is not that powerful, vigorous passion which is "strong as death," and which "many waters cannot quench." To suffer for others is thus not a mere burden laid in an arbitrary way upon the followers of Christ. It is not a mere test of their fidelity to their Lord. Nor is it only a severe probation through which they must pass, that their affections may be weaned from the present and directed to the future. It is not even a mere duty imposed upon us by the remembrance of Him

who gave Himself for us, the just for the unjust. That we shall suffer for others is implied in the very nature of a salvation adapted to man's condition. It is part of the process. It is that experience in which our salvation is wrought out, that in which we are brought nearest to the mind of God and Christ, so that we may say with one who has recently written with great thoughtfulness upon pain and self-sacrifice, "If God would give us the best and greatest gift, that which above all others we might long for and aspire after, even though in despair, it is this that He must give us, the privilege He gave His Son, to be used and sacrificed for the best and greatest end." ¹

"The joy that comes in sorrow's guise,
The sweet pains of self-sacrifice,
I would not have them otherwise."

While suffering for others is thus needed on the part of Christians, in order that they may themselves be perfected, it is not less needed in order that they may exert influence on the world. Men must see suffering endured for them and for their sakes if they are to acknowledge any power on the part of those who profess a desire to do them good. The spectacle of patient Christian suffering under ills directly inflicted by the hand of God may be a precious lesson to persons already, or almost wholly, within the pale of the Christian faith. It may be doubted whether it has much influence on the world. The world does not understand it. It may wonder, perhaps admire. Most probably it will treat the exhibition of such patience as something inexplicable, or as curiously illustrative of the delusions which men practise on themselves. If it is to own a right in the sufferers to speak to it, to warn it of error, or to demand its submission to views and ways different from those it has chosen, it must see more. Sacrifice of ourselves for others,

¹ Hinton, *Mystery of Pain*, p. 17.

bearing for their sakes toil or want or privation, is, according to the laws of human nature, the necessary condition of winning them to our side.

The point now contended for is taught in important passages of Scripture. How otherwise, for example, shall we explain the remarkable scene of the footwashing in John xiii.? After that scene our Lord said to the disciples, "Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call Me, Master, and, Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you" (vers 12-15). No one who has entered into the spirit of the fourth gospel will for an instant suppose that we are here taught nothing more than a lesson of humility and kindness. What had our Lord done to the disciples whom He is addressing? He had "bathed" them in His blood. He had taken them up into His own holy and blessed life. They were in Him; in Him their sins had been covered; they were united to Him, and in Him to God; they were "clean." But clean though they were, they could not live in this world without soiling their feet. Sins and shortcomings would mark them every day, not indeed of so serious a character as to destroy their interest in Christ, but enough to show that they stood in need of daily cleansing and of daily renewal of their consecration. In this sphere they were to offer for one another. In suffering and self-sacrifice they were to be victims for one another. The man strong to-day was to take up his weaker brother into his life, and to strengthen him. Weak himself to-morrow, he was to be taken up into the life of the man whom he had strengthened yesterday, and in him to obtain strength; until all, thus revived and completed in the communication of their brother's strength to make them strong, and of his life to make them live, were to be "clean every whit." This

cleansing then, not the ideal but the experimental cleansing—for Jesus said to them, “Ye are clean” (ver. 10)—was to be reached by offering, by self-sacrifice, by suffering for each other. Then the power of that sympathy and love, which were really Christ’s Divine life flowing through them all, would change each other’s sin into sinlessness, each other’s imperfection into perfection, and each other’s weakness into strength.

To a similar effect is the language of St. Paul in Colossians i. 24: “Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body’s sake, which is the Church.” It is impossible to accept as satisfactory the explanations usually given of these words, for all of them are marked by the effort to distinguish between the sufferings of Christ and those of His people, whereas the obvious intention of the apostle is, in one way or another, to identify them. St. Paul indeed would never have allowed that the sufferings of Christ lacked anything necessary to the full accomplishing of the purpose they were intended to effect. But that very purpose lay in this,—that, as Christ Himself was perfected through suffering, so the members of His Body might in Him be perfected, and might reach this perfection through suffering for their brethren’s good. To introduce into the words of the apostle a distinction between the sufferings of Christ as *satisfactoriæ* and in that sense *complete*, and as *ædificatoriæ* and in that sense *incomplete* and needing to be supplemented,¹ is to introduce a thought which does not seem to have been in the apostle’s mind, and which is inconsistent with his desire to bring out a *similarity* between Christ’s sufferings and the sufferings of His people. In a certain sense the sufferings of Christ, even when viewed as *satisfactoriæ*, may be spoken of as incomplete without the

¹ Comp. Lightfoot on Col. i. 24.

thought of His people; for when He offered Himself they were *in* Him, and without this His offering would have possessed only that character of a legal work, of a work to be imputed externally to man, which falls short of the teaching of Scripture upon the point. If therefore we would understand the language of the apostle, we must think of it as proceeding from the feeling, that just as Christ suffered for others, so the members of His Body suffer for others. To teach His people thus to suffer, to redeem them from the power of selfishness, and to impart to them the life and joy of love, was the aim of the Redeemer in what He did and suffered on our behalf. So long therefore as there is sin or weakness for which to suffer, sin or weakness which cannot be healed except through the sufferings of those who show that they have the spirit of their Master by trying to heal it, the offering of Christ is not "filled up." Its final result is not attained; nor will it be attained until, there being no more room for suffering on behalf of others, both the Head and the members, penetrated by the same life, shall be presented to the Father in one fulness of joy.

Taking these considerations into account, we seem to be justified in asking whether the Church has not been too chary of allowing the idea of offering for others to be connected with her position and life. It is surely without sufficient cause that she has been afraid of encroaching upon the one sacrifice of Christ, or of attributing to sinful men the possibility of making satisfaction for the sins of others. No one awakened to a sense of sin, and that is the condition of all believers, could for an instant entertain such a thought. So long as the Church feels—what ceasing to feel she ceases to be the Church—that in Christ alone is she accepted and complete, that her life is wholly in His life, and that her work is wholly done in the grace which He supplies, the thought of her making satisfaction

for others must in the nature of the case be entirely put aside. For the same reason, any idea of merit upon her part must be equally foreign to her thoughts. There can be no merit where all that is done by her is not merely at first bestowed upon her from without, but is at each moment maintained in her by influences flowing from the same source. Nay, more; the most powerful argument to expel, rather than foster, a sense of merit on the Church's part is to be found in the considerations now adduced. To produce humility there is certainly force in telling her that, as she suffers in following Christ, she is either undergoing a necessary discipline, or that she is only making a suitable return for the blessings which she has received. Yet there is far more force in reminding her that her sufferings have a deeper root, that they are an integral and indispensable part of her experience of redemption, and that in the very act of recognising that she owes all to Christ she must include her suffering for others as a part of her obligation and her debt.

Before passing on it may be well to add that the view now taken of the Church's priestly offering on earth appears to bring with it most momentous practical consequences. Of one only of these is it possible to speak at present, but it is too important to be omitted.

It will place the Church before the world in the true and proper relation in which she ought to stand to it. At the Pan-Presbyterian Council held in London last July a paper (since published in *THE EXPOSITOR* of the following October)¹ was read which, in spite of the objections made to it at the time, cannot be regarded otherwise than as one of interest and value. Dr. Dods said:

"It cannot, I think, be doubted, that the Church might have given a more distinct idea of Christianity and of what the true Christian is.

¹ Page 297.

It must frequently have been matter of astonishment, and even of something like dismay, to every reader to find how completely even the best educated assailants of Christianity misunderstand what it is. Not only in the lower class of freethinking journals, but in writers of the culture and knowledge of the late Cotter Morison, there is exhibited an almost unaccountable ignorance of the spirit and aims of Christianity. The Christian is represented as an obscurantist, afraid of light, and capable of swallowing the grossest absurdities; as a selfish, small-souled creature, whose object it is to save his own soul, and whose idea of saving his soul is escaping from punishment in a future life.

"For such misrepresentations the Church is responsible, in so far as it has not produced a type of Christianity which would make these conceptions impossible; and in so far as it has allowed faith in Christ to become identified in the popular mind with faith in a number of doctrines regarding Christ, and has thus made faith needlessly difficult, and to many minds repellent and impossible."¹

The words thus quoted are as unquestionably as they are painfully true. It is not indeed necessary to suppose that the writer undervalues, when they are kept in their proper place, the "doctrines" of which he speaks; nor does he probably fail to see as well as others that the *interpretation* of a revelation given in a person must be doctrinal. The main point of his contention is, that the Church is responsible for having so lived and acted, as to permit the world to suppose that the reception of any tenets, however Divine, constituted Christianity. Such a supposition is of course entirely erroneous, and the Church is bound to correct it. How is she to do so? Not by merely shortening her creeds, or by modifying the relations of her ministers and members to them. That procedure may be on other grounds wise. We have nothing to do with it just now. Enough that it will not correct the fatal misapprehension with which we are dealing. We have had in recent years a good deal of it, both in England and Scotland. Terms of subscription have been shortened; explanations have been added, till the explanation threatens to become as troublesome as the

¹ THE EXPOSITOR for October, 1888, pp. 299, 300.

creed; the idea that creeds are loose where men thought them definite, and that they possess a richly expansive, instead of a narrowly binding nature, has seized with sufficient firmness many a mind. Yet we do not see in the attitude of the Church to the world anything that gives more promise of convincing the world that the Church is Divine, than in days when men held by every iota of a creed as if it were the middle pillar of the house that upheld the house. It was in the midst of these later phenomena on which we have touched that Cotter Morison's book appeared. That book ought not to have been written, and it would not have been written had the Church been true to her commission, or had she presented Christianity to the world as her Lord, if He had been in our days upon the earth, would have presented it. In this last case we should have seen in Him—as things are, we ought to see in her—what is the real “service of man.” Noble words! The very utterance of them, like the utterance of those other words, “the enthusiasm of humanity,” elevates us. May it not be a matter of regret that both expressions should have come, not from the Church, but from those who either scorn her, or have little sympathy with her?

To return to the point before us. What the Church needs is revival in life and spirit, a keener appreciation of the fact that she is divinely called to occupy in the world her Lord's position, to take up there His work of doing good to man. Instead of declaiming against sacerdotalism and priesthood, she ought to see more clearly that her own highest destination is to be sacerdotal, is to be priestly. She has an offering, a sacrifice, to make; and it is the very essence of her condition to make it. That offering, that sacrifice, is herself; a sacrifice for the poor, the ignorant, the wretched, and the criminal, that she may win them into her own life, and in that life present them as an offering to the Father of the spirits of all flesh in the life, the offering

of her High Priest in heaven. When she does this, she will find that she has attained a greater element of power than she will ever acquire by thanking Heaven that she is not priestly.

We have spent so much time upon this first part of the Church's priesthood, that little space is left for its two other parts. A brief notice of them must suffice.

II. As in her priestly capacity the Church has an offering to make, so also, like her glorified Lord, she is an intercessor with the Father. And what is this intercession? We have already seen that it is not prayer alone, but the diligent performance of every office and every act by which the persons for whom she prays may be built up into the completeness, strength, and beauty of the Divine life in man. She has to form those who are as yet babes in Christ into perfect manhood, to give courage to the faint, to restore the fallen, to speak peace to the sensitive conscience, to lift up to higher notes of praise those who are already singing the Lord's song in a strange land. Of this "intercession," indeed, prayer is undoubtedly one of the most essential parts. Not only the prayers of individuals, but the prayers of the Church as a whole, ought to ascend continually to Him who says, "Put Me in remembrance; let us plead together; set forth thy cause, that thou mayest be justified" (Isa. xliii. 26). The world ought to know that, apart from the struggles in which it is engaged, from the distraction of thought from which it suffers, from the materialising tendencies of life,

"There are in this loud stunning tide
Of human care and crime,
With whom the melodies abide
Of the everlasting chime";

and who, within such veils as earth supplies, are sending up their unceasing prayers to Heaven on its behalf. Nor

would this only teach dependence upon others, and the superstitious feeling that without working out our own salvation we may be saved by the pious exertions on our behalf of those who love us. That may be the danger, but there is no good which has not its attendant danger; and surely it is better to think of salvation gained in some way than not to think of it at all. How often have a parent's, or a friend's, or a minister's prayers, accidentally overheard by their object, touched the heart of one wandering in sin, and done far more to reclaim him than words of direct remonstrance or reproof! How often has even the persuasion that Christian friends were praying for us lent us courage and hope in the hour of need! Let the Church "pray without ceasing" for her own members; let her "pray without ceasing" that through her the world may be made in truth the kingdom of God, and she will only be acting a part for which even nature pleads, and which is sanctified by grace. She cannot make a real offering, either of herself or for others, without occupying the position of her heavenly High Priest, and presenting her prayers, the prayers of all saints, as much incense, before the throne of the Majesty on high.

III. In fulfilling her priestly function the Church, like her Lord in heaven, dispenses blessings. The point thus touched on cannot be discussed at present. It would require separate treatment; for it opens up the whole question of the bestowal, not directly, but through the Church, of the Holy Spirit upon men. Yet, without entering upon this wide and in some respects difficult subject, it may surely be said that through the Church there is, according to the teaching of Scripture, the direct impartation of strengthening grace to those who do not close their hearts against it. Benediction, blessing, cannot be a mere form of words. There must be some reality beneath it. Nor can it be only prayer, or why does it not take the form of prayer alone?

When the apostles baptized the early converts to the faith they laid their hands upon them, and the Holy Spirit was given in their act of doing so. In Acts xiii. 3 it would even appear that, when Barnabas and Saul were separated for the particular work for which they are there described as called, the whole Church at Antioch took part in fitting them for the execution of their task. "Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

We cannot suppose that the Church of Christ now has less at her command than she had in the apostolic age, that Divine grace is less at her disposal now than it was then, or that there is anything in the Divine arrangements made for her in her later history by which the efficacy of her early influence is limited and restrained. When, accordingly, we read so often in the Acts of the Apostles of the bestowal of the Spirit as of something distinct from prayer, we are entitled to infer that there is blessing of a similar kind still bestowed through the action of the Church in word and sacrament. Not that the Church is the source of blessing, any more than she is the source of offering. Rather may it be said that, as she carries out and applies the offering wherewith Christ offers Himself to the Father, so she carries out and applies the blessing wherewith He blesses. But that blessing is real. Under all circumstances it comes forth from Him who has in Himself the "fulness" of grace; and, when it is not accepted by the world, it returns to His people for their own increase in holiness and comfort. Pentecostal seasons did not close with the day of Pentecost. He who then came down in tongues of flame is not confined to an upper room in Jerusalem, nor is the fire of His influence less potent at the present day than it was then. It may appear in different forms; but it appeared in different forms even in the apostolic Church. Let it be enough for us to know that, amidst constantly changing circumstances

and conditions of life, the Spirit of God is still given with a power not less intimately adapted to them, and not less capable of producing the same heavenly life in the earthly homes and haunts of men.

Such then is the priesthood of the Church ; and it will be observed that it includes far more important functions than those generally spoken of by writers on the universal Christian priesthood, or the present priesthood of believers. It is not enough to say with Bishop Moberly that the Christian, in the power of his personal priesthood, may cultivate a true and perfect faith ; that he has a right to the Holy Scriptures ; that he has a title to the sacred doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ; that he may go before God in repentance and confession of sin ; and that he may pray.¹ These privileges belong to man as man, and they fail to express the distinguishing characteristics of the priestly position of the members of the Body of Christ. That position involves far more, for it involves the privilege of constantly drawing near to God in Christ, and in full assurance of faith. It involves an immediate and full participation in the Divine love, so that that love shall flow in rich abundance through all the members of the Body, and shall animate each to the office for which it possesses "natural ability." It involves the right, not merely the power (John i. 12), of each to make first an offering of himself to God, and then of himself for others, so that we may share the mind of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. It involves the privilege of so helping weak Christian brethren as to convey to them the sense of God's pardoning mercy and the assurance of strength that is perfected in weakness. And, finally, it involves the right to confer that Spirit of the Head at once Divine and human which fills and satisfies every want of our nature as the rising tide runs up and fills every ripple of sand upon the beach.

¹ *Administration of the Holy Spirit*, p. 252.

At this moment nothing is more imperatively demanded of the Church than a revival of that idea of her priestliness which flows directly from the fact that she lives in Him who is our High Priest in heaven. The idea has been left too long associated with periods of unscriptural domination on the part of the clergy, and of ignorance and superstition on the part of the laity. In spite of this, it is alike true and fundamental. A clear perception and a bold enunciation of the Church's priestly character lies at the very root of all that is most distinctive, most real, most forcible, and most valuable in her work. The duty of the Church is not to abandon a position to which she has been divinely called, because it has been abused, and may be abused again. It is, rather, so to occupy it that the fears of timorous friends may be dispelled, and the reproaches of opponents silenced. The aim of true priesthood is not wealth or station or power. It is love, work, self-sacrifice! The anointing in Bethany was accepted by the Redeemer as His consecration, not to worldly honours, but to His "burying"; and to such a burying, not to ease and the high places of the earth, is the Church in her turn consecrated. She has not gained much by casting the thought of her priestliness aside. Let her again proclaim it, not so much in word as in deed; and it may be that men will be more ready to listen to her message, and that the house will once more be filled with the odour of the ointment.

W. MILLIGAN.

JESUS CROWNED FOR DEATH.

HEBREWS II. 5-9.

It is almost presumptuous for any third party to interpose in a discussion between scholars so eminent and honoured as Drs. Bruce and Davidson, and upon a subject of such difficulty and such importance as the interpretation of Hebrews ii. 9.

“Non nostrum inter vos tantas componere lites.”

The writer's apology lies in the fact that the passage in question is one that needs to be examined from different points of view; and that it has possessed for himself, ever since he began to study the Greek Testament, a peculiar fascination. He has long been convinced that the traditional construction of this verse is on grammatical grounds quite untenable; and has been led, independently, to a line of interpretation looking in the same direction as that so ably developed by Drs. Bruce and Matheson, though not altogether coincident with it. Hofmann,¹ to his thinking, throws a more searching light upon this subtle and profound text than any other modern exegete.

Let us however, with Dr. Davidson, dismiss all “fine modern ideas,” and at the same time those “scriptural conceptions” which are sometimes but another name for theological prejudgments, and an innocent cover for attempts to force the language of one inspired writer into the mould taken by the mind of another. We are dealing in this

¹ J. C. K. von Hofmann: *Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments (fünfter Theil; Hebräerbrief)*. Hofmann's exegesis is marred too often by the caprice and strained ingenuity which Meyer exposes so unsparingly. He is nevertheless an expositor of profound learning and brilliant originality. His method is most instructive and stimulating; and his work teems with keen criticisms and luminous *aperçus*. One learns almost as much when differing from him as when agreeing with him.

great epistle with a truly Pauline man, but an independent thinker, and one who has good right to be heard on his own account. The πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως with which he begins is an advertisement to this effect. Let us watch him as he pens these solemn and inspiring words, with the Old Testament open by his side, and the life and death of Jesus spread like a living picture before his memory, writing to his Hebrew Christian brethren on the eve of the fall of their national Judaism, and striving to assure them of the stability of the "new and better covenant," and the completeness of the salvation which it brings, and, above all, to raise them to a worthier conception of the glory and perfectness of their High Priest and Mediator.

The starting-point of the writer's thought in chap. ii. 5 we find in the last words of chap. i. The angels, he says, "are ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of the destined heirs of salvation." The interjected homily imports no new thought, but simply enforces what has been already said, the apostle at the end of it resuming the thread of his previous exposition. Now what is the idea suggested by the animated question of chap. i. 14? It is surely that of *the nobility of man*, the honour put upon "the heirs of salvation" and the glory of their calling, in whose interest the angels are engaged, those flaming messengers of the heavenly court, worshippers and servants of the Son "in whom" God thought fit to "speak to us." If the greatness of the Son of God, as author of the new revelation, is the reflection uppermost in the writer's mind, the dignity of those to whom He thus speaks, the importance of their position and the grave responsibility it brings upon them, are no less present to his thoughts. It is this consideration that gives its peculiar urgency to the appeal, "How shall *we* escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" This underlying sense of the unparalleled distinction accruing to the status of Christian believers comes out again and

again in the course of the epistle. "Holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling," who may "enter boldly into the holy place," for whom "God provided a better thing" than for the greatest of His ancient saints, "receiving the promise of an eternal inheritance" and "a kingdom that cannot be shaken": in such terms the apostle exhorts the desponding Hebrews, rousing them to a higher sense of the grandeur of their vocation and destiny as redeemed men, while he sets before them the supreme greatness, at once Divine and human, of their Redeemer.

To "those who shall be heirs of salvation" therefore, "not to angels," belongs "the world¹ that shall be." We catch in the emphatic *τὴν μέλλουσαν* of this verse a clear echo of the triumphant *διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν* of chap. i. 14. Not to angels, but to men, heirs of God's promise, is the glorious world to be subject which prophecy describes, and of which the Christian teacher has to speak (ver. 5). *Man is to be lord in man's world.* While the angels in the kingdom of God's Son play a subsidiary but most willing part, to mankind He holds a more intimate relation. "Partakers of Christ," who is "Son over His house," the heirs of salvation "receive a kingdom" in which, as it is promised in the Apocalypse, they shall at last "sit down with Him in His throne." Such is the goal of the Christian salvation, the inheritance that Christ confers on His true brethren. The path of suffering by which it is attained, the way in which Christ has identified Himself with men and linked their destiny to His own, the sequel has to show.

It is primarily to support the assertion of man's promised greatness that the eighth Psalm is put in evidence (vers.

τὴν οἰκουμένην, the inhabited world, the world as the home of man, into which "the First-born" will be "brought again" (chap. i. 6). It is in this connexion—not as the metaphysical Universe—that the *πάντα* and *τὰ πάντα* of Ps. viii. and of this context must be understood. Comp. Wisdom i. 7.

6-8). What is earth-born man? Poor insignificance! he stands looking up to the splendour and majesty of God's eternal heavens! Strange that the Maker of those gleaming, unnumbered worlds should have regard to him! And yet God has stamped on man His image, setting him not far below His angels,¹ crowning him with glory and honour, and making the world a realm for him to rule. Such is the ideal view of man's relation to his own world. It is upon this pattern that his renewal is to be effected, as St. Paul has already taught us, "after the image of Him that created him" (Col. iii. 10). Man's salvation cannot stop short of the recovery of this lapsed dominion. And our teacher will not have this heritage diminished, nor the ideal of human dignity and power lowered in any wise to the level of the humiliating fact: "For in subjecting all things to man, there is nothing that He left unsubjected to him." So far, let us observe, the apostle's question is simply that of the psalmist, "What is man? or man's son (Adam's race)?"—a phrase that we have no business to turn into "*the Son of man*," as though it were a designation of Christ alone. We rob ourselves of the precious import of the Psalm when we force it, unwarrantably, into the Messianic grooves. The New Testament writers do not use the older Scriptures in such fanciful and arbitrary fashion as seems to be often assumed. It is man's estate, designed for him from creation, that is held out to the view of Christian faith; and we are assured that no jot or tittle of the promise shall be allowed to fail.

Turn now from this ideal to the melancholy fact. "But now we see not yet all things made subject to him." There is a tragic *litotes* here: the stress of the sentence

¹ Here Shakespeare is no bad commentator. "What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god!" (*Hamlet*.)

rests on the words *made subject* (αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποταγμένα), indicating that the very opposite is the case; as when St. Paul writes in 1 Corinthians xi. 22, "I *praise* you not," to express the severest blame.¹ Instead of being master of the world over which God set him, man is like a guilty, cowering slave, "all his lifetime subject to bondage through fear of death" (ver. 15). Death has reversed our lordship over nature, and changed it to servitude. At this point it is enough simply to state the negative fact. As things are, man's royalty is forfeited, his crown is in the dust; and the apostle, looking out on the world around him, says with a sigh, "We see not yet all things subjected to him." Clearly this supremacy, if it is ever to be attained and the Psalm is anything more than a poet's dream, belongs to some future world, to a state of things far different from the present, and can only be brought about by a great salvation.

But is this all we descry on the horizon? Is the world nothing for man but a scene of failure and discomfiture? Not so. The vision of the psalmist indeed "we see not yet"; it is prophecy. But there is something we *do see* that lifts our hopes to the highest pitch. There is One to whom the prophetic words apply as to no other son of man, in whom we have the earnest of their full accomplishment: "Him that hath been in some little set below the angels, even JESUS."

It is *Jesus*, Son of Mary, Child of man, whose appearance we hail; not now, as in chap. i., *the Son of God*, resplendent in His Father's glory with His holy angels, sustaining creation by His word. The writer is approaching the Redeemer's person from the opposite side, and adopting quite a different line of reflection from that with which the epistle commenced. He will afterwards unite both conceptions in

¹ Similarly, in ver. 11 below, Christ "is not *ashamed* to call them brethren," —rejoicing, glorying therein (Bruce).

his definition of "our great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God." We must allow him to work out his argument in his own way.

Here is a Man then in whom humanity is lifted from the dust, and once more grows conscious of its primal dignity. The advent of Jesus raises immeasurably our conception of the possibilities of human nature, and supplies a new and magnificent answer to the old question, "What is man?" Prophecy is outdone by what we see in Jesus of man's greatness as the object of the Divine regard. And this Leader of our salvation is "forerunner" of His brethren's exaltation, both in earth and heaven.

On every ground we find ourselves compelled to refer the predicate "crowned with glory and honour," in ver. 9, to the *earthly life and human relationship* of our Saviour. Surely it is in this environment that we see Jesus (*βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν*). It is amazing that exegetes like Kurtz and Lünemann should render *βλέπομεν* "see with the eyes of faith," or, "the eyes of the spirit," and refer to chap. iii. 19 in proof! If there is a word in the New Testament that denotes *sight as opposed to faith*, it is just this verb *βλέπω*. "Faith," in chap. xi. 1, is a "proof of things not seen" (*οὐ βλέπομένων*); similarly in 2 Corinthians iv. 18, "the things seen (*τ. βλέπομενα*) are temporal; but the things not seen (*τ. μὴ βλέπομενα*), eternal."¹ What "we see" in chap. iii. 19 belongs not to the region of spiritual truth, but of historical fact. That their unbelief drove the Israelites back to the wilderness is a certainty to the Hebrew reader, "gross as a mountain, open, palpable." History verifies the teaching of faith. To misread *βλέπομεν* is to miss an essential point in the warning example given in chap. iii.

¹ Comp. also Heb. xi. 7, Rom. viii. 25, John ix. 7, etc., for the matter-of-fact character of the *seeing* denoted by *βλέπω*. The verb appears to be chosen here for this reason, in distinction from the more general *ὁρώμεν* which precedes. "We *do see*," in contrast with "see," may serve to indicate this difference.

And what "we see" in the passage before us is to be found not in the supernal regions of Christ's heavenly reign, but in the familiar scenes of His blessed life on earth, in "the things which," as St. John says, "we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, concerning the Word of life." We to-day "see Jesus" in the story of the Four, as the readers of this letter saw Him in the living words of His eye-witnesses and ministers.

And "we see Him for¹ the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour." No words could more fitly express the strange blending of glory and suffering visible throughout the earthly course of Jesus,—glory ever leading on to suffering, and finding in death its climax and hidden purpose. If man's ideal greatness is the starting-point of the writer's thought, the death of the cross is always its centre. The former, for sinful (chap. i. 3) and death-bound man, can only win its realisation through the latter. *Jesus is crowned for death.* Willingly would Israel have given Him in life the Messiah's crown. They could not understand why One so high in the grace of God, so rich in kingly qualities and powers, did not take the last remaining step and mount to David's throne. Their fury against Him at the last was, in the breasts of many who cried, "Away with Him!" the rage of a bitter disappointment. They did not see that the higher He was raised in favour with God and men, the nearer and the more needful became His death. If this is a "fine modern idea," then also is that of "the corn of wheat" that "falls into the ground to die," and indeed the whole teaching of John xii. 12-33 comes under the same designation. It is enough to refer to the

¹ διὰ, on our view of the text, is almost equivalent to εἰς, and looks forward to the ὁπως γεύσεται, κ.τ.λ., much as in chap. ix. 15, 1 Tim. i. 16, 2 Tim. ii. 10. It signifies, as always with the accusative, the *ground* or *reason* of the event specified; only in this case the reason lies in a subsequent, not, as commonly, a precedent event. There is the same *prospective* διὰ in Rom. iv. 25b, on the usual interpretation. See *Lidd. and Scott*, διὰ, B. iii. 2.

scene of the transfiguration,¹ and of the royal entry into Jerusalem, to show the profound connection which existed, alike in the mind of Jesus, in the purpose of God, and in the sequence of history, between Christ's human glorification and His sacrificial death.

Two important grammatical considerations remain to be noticed, which will serve further to elucidate, and, as we think, verify our construction of the text. The object of the verb "see," in ver. 9, according to the Greek order, is not "Jesus" in the first instance, but "Him that is made some little lower than angels,"² who is at once identified with "Jesus," for of Him this was manifestly and eminently true. Then follows the predicate, "for the suffering," etc. It is to be noted that the participles "made lower" and "crowned" are in precisely the same tense and grammatical form (*ἡλαττωμένον, ἐστεφανωμένον*: perfects passive). The presumption is that they denote *contemporary*, rather than successive states, just as it is with the corresponding verbs in the language of the Psalm. Had the apostle intended to distinguish by these expressions an antecedent and consequent condition, how easy for this master of Greek idiom—and how necessary with the parallelism of the psalmist leading the reader the other way—to have made the transition clear by a change of

¹ The words of 2 Pet. i. 16, 17, which we confidently claim as apostolic tradition, agree closely with those of the text: "We made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, being eye-witnesses of His majesty. For He received from God the Father *honour and glory*, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory . . . in the holy mount." Perhaps the writer of the Hebrews had this scene specifically before his mind. We note as at least a singular coincidence that the phrase *taste of death* occurs also in this context in the synoptic tradition (Matt. xvi. 28, Mark ix. 1, Luke ix. 27); it is used but once besides in the N.T.

² This is no term of disparagement in the Psalm, nor need it be here as applied to the earthly humanity of Jesus. It does not describe the *exinanition* of Philippians ii. 6, but refers to the contemporary states of different persons (*men, Jesus, and angels*), rather than the successive states of the same person (*the pre-incarnate and incarnate Son of God*).

tense (τ. ἐλλαττωθέντα), or by some distinctive adverb, as, for example, in our own couplet:

“High o’er the angelic bands He rears
His once dishonoured head”!

But he does nothing of the kind, for he means nothing of the kind. While in His human guise Jesus was in some sort lower than the angels, at the same time, and notwithstanding, He was crowned with glory. Through all that is best in human life there runs the same mixture of honour and humbleness, of greatness crossed by the shadow of death.

But the ὅπως of the last clause is the *crux* of the common interpretation. When it is said, “crowned in order that He might taste death,” to make the “crowning” subsequent to the “death” is literally *preposterous*. The connexion is just as obvious and straightforward in the Greek as in the English. None of the many ingenious attempts that have been made to escape this inference, and to turn purpose into consequence—by shifting the order of the words, or by evading the force of the conjunction—is in the least satisfactory.¹ Surely the apostle must be allowed to have his own mind, and to be capable of expressing himself with reasonable plainness. No Greek reader, we venture to affirm, coming upon these words for the first time, and without theological prejudice, could have guessed that they meant anything else than that Jesus was crowned with the purpose that He might offer for all men the sacrifice of His death.

St. Paul’s teaching in Philippians ii. 5–11 has, it seems to us, dominated the exegesis of this text greatly to its

¹ This applies, we say it with profound respect, to Dr. Edwards’ rendering: “That He may have tasted death for every man” (*Expositor’s Bible*: “Hebrews,” p. 37), which seems to us to be neither good grammar nor clear sense. If the apostle meant, “that His tasting of death *might avail* for every man,” he knew how to say it.

injury. Sublime and precious as the doctrine of that passage is, it does not contain the whole of Christology. The view it presents of Christ's earthly life as a state of exinanition and humiliation is that of a man in whose memory everything else paled before the vision of the celestial Jesus he had seen on the way to Damascus. But our author looks with different eyes; and he teaches us a truth only less important, and complementary to that enforced by the Apostle Paul. The life of Jesus was far other than one of mere ignominy and obscuratation. From the Divine and heavenly side it was indeed a dark eclipse; but from the earthward side it was a splendid revelation. As His disciples looked upon His face, and watched His miracles, and listened to His words, "such as never man spake," and felt the spell of the moral majesty that clothed His person, the saying of the eighth Psalm must often, one thinks, have come to their minds. Seeing Jesus in the gospel story, we ourselves "glory in the Lord," and exult to think that He hath so regarded our low estate; we exult to think that humanity is thus ennobled, and that "He is not ashamed to call us brethren."

G. G. FINDLAY.

FARRAR'S "LIVES OF THE FATHERS."¹

THE full title of Archdeacon Farrar's new work accurately describes it: *Lives of the Fathers: Sketches of Church History in Biography*; and the idea he has had in writing it may be gathered from the motto which he derives from Bishop Wordsworth and places on his title-page, "The history of the Church is represented in certain respects by the history of her great men." He has no intention of rivalling Bishop Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, or of earning so rare an encomium as was pronounced on that masterpiece by the most competent judge, Prof. Harnack, when he declared it to be "the most learned and careful patristic monograph which has appeared in the nineteenth century." His intention has been to "connect the history of the Church during the first four centuries with the lives of her principal Fathers and teachers." This has been admirably done by Böhringer in his *Kirchengeschichte in Biographien*, a book which deserves to be translated and which is written in a style rarely attained by German theological writers. But Dr. Farrar has judged it expedient to give less attention to questions of abstract theology than Böhringer. This will be regretted by some readers, but unquestionably it will win for his book a wider popularity.

There can be no question that there was room for such a book as Dr. Farrar has given us. The Fathers have always attracted the learned labour of scholars, but in no age has so much been done as in our own to illuminate the first four centuries. The results of research and criticism lie scattered in monographs, in contributions to dictionaries, in the hints and papers of specialists. These results Dr. Farrar has brought together, has revised and analysed them, and uniting them with much research of his own, has presented them in an accessible and admirable form. Specialists may find that Dr. Farrar's omnivorous reading has not included some article or paper on a pet subject of their own; but undoubtedly the best literature, including the works of the Fathers themselves and the original material for their biography, has been not only under his eye, but has been well digested. His most remarkable omission suggests that other patristic students may

¹ *Lives of the Fathers: Sketches of Church History in Biography.* By Frederic W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 2 vols. (Adam & Charles Black.)

also need to be informed that Mr. Ernest C. Richardson, librarian of Hartford Theological Seminary, has issued a *Bibliographical Synopsis* which is virtually a perfect guide to the bibliography of the ante-nicene Fathers. It is needless to say, for it has been manifest in all Dr. Farrar's writings, that he breathes easily and moves freely and gracefully under a ponderous mass of learning which would crush a less powerful man. How proud we all are to find him napping! It is a feather in the critic's cap to point out one mistake among a thousand facts which he reads for the first time. Unfortunately in this work Dr. Farrar gives the critic occasion. It was to be expected that where so much Greek is quoted, misprints should occur. The expectation is realized. The employment of a careful reviser would have prevented this, and would also have altered *puticoli* into *puticuli*, and saved Dr. Farrar from introducing three innovations into two lines from Milton. Disregard for trifles is an estimable feature in a man and in an author, and it is really of absolutely no consequence to Dr. Farrar's argument whether the Marsian war belongs to B.C. 40 or B.C. 90; but there are not wanting persons who will say that if he is incorrect in this, he will be incorrect in other statements. Into other mistakes of a similar kind he has been led by his authorities. Thus he says: "The bodies were largely taken from [the catacombs] by Pope Paul I. in A.D. 751, to save them from the relic-stealing propensities of Astaulph, king of the Goths." In fact, the ransacking of the tombs by Astaulph occurred in 752, and Paul did not attain the Papal dignity till 757, when Astaulph had already been dead for some years.

Sometimes Dr. Farrar's mistakes are more serious. The account he gives of the Ignatian Epistles is misleading. "The longer Greek recension consisted of fifteen letters, of which the Latin text was published in 1495 and in 1498, and the Greek text by Hartung in 1557. Three of these professed to be the correspondence of Ignatius with St. John and the Virgin, with her answer. They are stupid forgeries. There were, besides, Greek letters to Mary of Cassobola, the Tarsians, Philippians, the Antiochenes, and his successor Hero." These with the seven genuine epistles make up the fifteen. Now from this statement the uninitiated reader could certainly not gather the facts of the case, which are, that the Latin text of 1495 and 1498 contained respectively three and eleven letters, not fifteen; that the edition

published by Hartung in 1557 contained the Greek text of only twelve epistles; and that what is known as the longer Greek recension really contains thirteen letters. It may also be remarked that the editor here named Hartung is more commonly known as Paccus, his full name being Valentinus Hartung Frid, which in the customary way he Latinized into Paccus. By a misprint on the following page the edition of Voss is represented as published in the same year as Ussher's, whereas it appeared two years later.

But enough of such picking of holes. These little flaws do not enter into the substance of the work, which is throughout solid and well-wrought. It is freely and vividly written, and those who are best acquainted with the Fathers and their writings will know how much is implied when it is said that from the first page to the last Dr. Farrar's work is intensely interesting. He has entered with the fullest intelligence and with sensitive human sympathy into those early times, and has vitalized them. He has taken the Fathers out of the hands of scholars and theologians, and made them common property and companionable figures. Dr. Farrar has never used his great gifts and acquirements to better purpose than in dissipating the dreariness of that remote period of Church history, and in dispelling the mists in which a false and narrow ecclesiasticism has enveloped the Fathers. And it is matter of congratulation that this book, which most successfully popularizes their teaching, at the same time exposes the childishness of many views and usages which, because primitive, have gained currency. There can be no doubt that Dr. Farrar's volumes will find a response in many a candid mind. He has produced a book which will long be a standard work. It fills, and fills excellently, a serious gap in our literature. It will be widely read, and wherever it is read, it will not only give pleasure by its graphic pictures and eloquent passages, but will convey important information which it is most desirable that the public should know.

MARCUS DODS.

RECENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE IN THE UNITED STATES.

HEBREW GRAMMARS.—Two important works on Hebrew grammar have appeared from leading Old Testament scholars, one by Dr. Green, of Princeton, the other by Dr. Harper, of Yale.

The work¹ by Dr. Green is a new edition of his grammar published twenty-seven years ago, with which American and English scholars are well acquainted. While it bears marks of careful revision throughout, the syntax has been recast, and has been enlarged from forty-seven pages in the old edition to one hundred and twenty-seven in the new. Dr. Green's grammar is the most complete treatise that we possess on the Hebrew language in English, and it does not suffer in comparison with the best Hebrew grammars in German. Taking into account its exhaustive indices, it possesses incomparable advantages over mere translations of German Hebrew grammars.

The most serious blemish in this treatise, as we think, is the retention of the old terminology, preterite and future, not because it is old, but because it seems to be pretty well established that the Hebrew verb does not exhibit distinctions of time, but rather of action or state, as complete or incomplete. Indeed this distinction seems to be characteristic of all Semitic languages. Even the Assyrian, as Sayce has shown, in its original character, does not furnish an exception. Nevertheless no English or American Old Testament scholar who cannot use German readily, and who wishes to secure a mastery of the language, can afford to be without this grammar.

Dr. Harper has done more, we think, to popularize the study of Hebrew than any man who has ever lived. The great revival of interest in Hebrew learning in America is largely due to this Hebrew evangelist. He has instructed hundreds, if not thousands, by correspondence, and in the Hebrew summer schools, of which he is the inspiration. Possessed of unusual enthusiasm, and executive ability, and of an iron industry, he has thrown his whole being into the promotion of Semitic studies.

¹ *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language.* New Edition, carefully Revised throughout and the Syntax greatly Enlarged. (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1888.)

We have reason then to be interested in all his books, as instruments already tested by one of the most successful teachers who has ever appeared in the New World.

All his text-books, of which he has now published three, are arranged on the inductive method. The first takes the student by the hand, pointing out the facts of the Hebrew language, and then gradually constructs his system. His *Elements of Hebrew Syntax*,¹ is arranged on the same plan. He does not claim originality of scholarship, but simply a practical adaptation of means to an end. His method may be illustrated by the first paragraph under the noun, which is entitled "The Noun, used Collectively." Under this heading he gives fifteen Hebrew words, with their meanings and references to the passages where they occur, under four classes of examples. Then follows a general statement as to collective nouns, and four definitions. Below these are four remarks, and then twenty Scripture references for study.

America thus sends her challenge to Prof. A. B. Davidson, of Edinburgh, to whom we have long looked for a complete and scientific statement of the principles of Hebrew syntax. There is certainly room for such a book, and Prof. Davidson is the man to prepare it.

PENTATEUCH CRITICISM.—Twelve of our Old Testament scholars have combined to erect a bulwark against the modern critical school as represented by Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, by means of a little volume entitled, *Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism. By Various Writers*.² The object of the *Essays* is to establish the evidences of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. All the writers occupy substantially the same standpoint, although Dr. Schodde approaches somewhat the principles of criticism held by such scholars as the elder Delitzsch, Strack, Cheyne, and Driver. Chambers gives a brief historical introduction. Gardiner discusses the question, "Was the religion of Israel a revelation or a merely human development?" Bissell, who is well known through his volume on *The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure*, seeks to show that there is no conflict in the precepts of the Pentateuch codes. Green subjects the analysis of the critics in the first eleven chapters of Exodus to an acute examination, and concludes that "the critical hypothesis is beset by insuperable difficulties."

¹ Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1883.

² Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1888.

Schodde, while admitting that the Pentateuch does not furnish any direct testimony to prove "that Moses himself wrote or caused to be written the whole of the five books," finds strong indirect testimony, which is sustained by the New Testament. Nevertheless he says the Pentateuch is not Mosaic "in the sense that every word of it was written by the lawgiver, but in the sense that the laws were promulgated through him." Beecher adduces the testimony of the historical books, save Chronicles, to the authorship of the Pentateuch; Terry that of Chronicles; and Harmon of the prophetic and poetical books of the Old Testament. Dwinell treats in a dogmatic tone of "the higher criticism and a spent Bible." Streibert presents the difficulties of the new hypothesis, and Hemphill emphasises the validity and bearing of the testimony of Christ and His apostles. Osgood directs especial attention to the peoples among whom the children of Israel originated and attained their majority,—Assyria, Egypt, and ancient Syria,—and argues against the assumption of those critics who believe them to have been an ignorant horde of barbarians, and entirely destitute of the first pre-requisites of a literature in the time of Moses.

EXEGESIS.—The year has not been fruitful in commentaries. A little pamphlet (50 pp.) by Rev. William C. Daland, on the *Song of Songs*, is worthy of mention. He considers the Song of Songs a drama in five acts, a product of the wisdom literature of the time of Solomon, and that the object of it is to set forth the triumph of woman's virtue over the powerful seductions of Solomon. He finds in it a companion piece to the book of Job. The translation is beautiful, and the notes are brief and pertinent.

ANTIQUITIES.—A book especially adapted for the wants of Sunday-school teachers on *Biblical Antiquities*,¹ has been prepared by Dr. Bissell, whose name has been already mentioned. It is divided into three parts: "Domestic Antiquities," "Civil Antiquities," and "Sacred Antiquities." Dr. Bissell's previous studies have fitted him pre-eminently for the preparation of such a work. It indicates industry and research, but does not enter into the discussion of critical questions.

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS.

¹ The American Sunday-school Union, Philadelphia, 1888.

BREVIA.

La Langue parlée par N. S. Jésus-Christ sur la Terre.¹

—The Syrian Archbishop of Damascus, in communion with the see of Rome, has published in the *Revue illustrée de la Terre Sainte et de l'Orient catholique*, a very lucid, fact-full, and cogent discussion of the question indicated in the above title. As the most reverend author states, and as I was assured myself at Damascus, that once learned city is now more destitute than ever of the varied critical apparatus necessary for the researches of the scholar. This essay is therefore not to be compared with the article, from a bibliographical point of view especially, so exhaustive of Dr. Neubauer,² who so thoroughly disproves the theory of Mark Pattison, that a good librarian cannot also be erudite. This is what the archbishop claims to have shown: that the Jews of Palestine, in the time of Jesus Christ, wrote in "Chaldee" and rarely in Hebrew; that the proper names of persons and places used by them were often "Chaldee"; that the words pronounced by our Lord, according to the New Testament, and those addressed to Him, prove that the language then prevalent in Palestine was "Chaldee"; that the name of Greeks was often given then to other nations, to distinguish them from the Jews, who consequently were not Greeks by language; that there were at Jerusalem, and in other cities of Palestine, Jews distinguished from others by their use of Greek (which they had learned in foreign countries); that for the Jews of Palestine the Bible had to be translated into "Chaldee," and not into Greek; that the use of "Chaldee," at least in literature, continued among the Christians of Palestine down to the thirteenth century, and even later, and among the Jews even to our own time; lastly, that Greek only became predominant at Jerusalem at the beginning of the second century. The most interesting part of the essay begins at section 7, which treats of the vicissitudes of the Syro-Palestinian dialect. The student would do well to read first the column relative to the subject in Nöldeke's article, "Semitic Languages," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*; he will then have a framework into which he can set the facts put together by Archbishop David. The chain of facts is indeed

¹ Paris aux bureaux de l'œuvre des écoles d'Orient, 1889.

² *Studia Biblica*, vol. i., pp. 39-74.

complete. Even after the Jewish Aramaic ceased to be spoken, through the invasion of the Arabs and their tongue, the Melchite Church (comp. Tozer, *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, p. 74) continued to use Syro-Palestinian as its sacred tongue, and since the end of the last century manuscript records of this dialect have been gradually collected. Even now, at no great distance from Damascus, there are three villages, the chief of which is called Ma'lûla, in which the language of Jesus Christ, or a dialect differing little from it, is spoken.

In sections 8 and 9 the archbishop examines the difficulties connected with the Septuagint version. Perhaps he exaggerates the degree of hostility to Greek among the Jews of Palestine in the time of the Ptolemies, but it was an easy task to refute the argument which the opposite side had set up. In fact, altogether one may value this essay more for its facts than for its argument—lucid as this may be,—and most of all perhaps as a specimen of the critical insight of the learned Syrian. The author does not absolutely reject the opinion that our Lord and the apostles read the Scriptures in Hebrew, but thinks it much more probable that they used an Aramaic version. In a footnote he justifies the former view by Jerome's notice, in his thirty-sixth letter to Pope Damasus, that he employed for his own Latin translation the Hebrew Bible used in the synagogue of Bethlehem.

Not the least interesting passage in the essay is an expression of patriotic opinion which "a learned Oratorian of London," Father Philpin de Rivière, criticises in a letter to the same review in which the archbishop's paper was printed. "Always," says the archbishop, "it will remain a most memorable and surprising fact, that Hebrew was so lightly esteemed in the early Christian Church; that the original Bible, written in that tongue, was only admitted at a much later time; and that no part of the New Testament was written, or at least preserved, in Hebrew; that no one thought of giving to Jewish converts the New Testament translated into Hebrew; that, while the unconverted Jews employed the Hebrew tongue in their writings, nothing was written, or at least preserved, in the Christian Church in the language in which God had spoken to the patriarch and the prophets. First Greek, then Latin and Syriac, in which the first monuments of the church were written, have not allowed Hebrew to say even a word." This, he says, accounts for the fact that the New Testament, as well as

the "Deutero-canonical" books of the Old Testament, and all the Apocryphal books having relation to the Holy Scripture, have come down to us only in Greek. But, he adds, we must not infer from this that the whole of the New Testament was written in Greek; and not only the first gospel, but the "Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews," was written in Hebrew or (rather) in Syro-Palestinian.

In the appendix, Archbishop David makes modest and graceful recognition of Dr. Neubauer's valuable work, and expresses a difference of opinion on some points of detail. Like that "learned academician" (is there any subtle irony?) however, he accedes to the new view of M. Halévy, that St. Paul's Aramaic phrase in 1 Corinthians xvi. 22 should be read "*Marana tha*," i.e. "Our Lord, come." He also touches on the further question. "Did our Lord *ever* speak Greek?" After examining the passages of the gospels relative to non-Jewish persons who came into contact with our Lord, his answer is the negative. Similarly for the first disciples; but he makes an exception for the great discourse of Stephen in Acts vii., inasmuch as the assembly which he addressed seems to have consisted exclusively of Hellenists (Acts vi. 9). Is there any Semitic scholar of eminence, or any one well versed in later Jewish history and literature, who holds a different opinion on this whole controversy from Archbishop David and Dr. Neubauer? Here and there an argument may be forced, but the general position is, from a philological and historical point of view, unassailable.

T. K. CHEYNE.

ST. JAMES THE APOSTLE.

WHEN we come to inquire closely about the Apostles, and when we consider the acknowledged part played by them in an event so stupendous as the spread of Christianity, we may well be astonished to find how very little we know about any of them, except two or three. How immense was the dignity assigned to them is shown by the promise of Christ, "When the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And how rapidly the grandeur of their position was acknowledged, even among the earliest groups of Gentile converts, we see from St. Paul's allusion to "the Twelve" as a recognised designation, and from the fact that St. John, as far back as the days in which he wrote the Apocalypse, sees the names of "the Twelve Apostles" graven on the twelve precious stones which are the foundations of the City of God. And yet, from this little body of the first Preachers and Witnesses of the Gospel, who had been with Jesus from the beginning, two only—St. Peter and St. John—are really well known to us. There are three of "the glorious company of the Apostles"—James the Little,¹ Jude the son of James, and Simon the Cananæan or Zealot—of whom we cannot be said to know anything whatever, though St. John does record a single question of "Judas, not Iscariot."² Of Matthew nothing is recorded except his call and his farewell feast; of Bartholomew absolutely nothing, unless we regard as certain the conjecture which identifies him with Nathanael; of Thomas

¹ ὁ μικρός. He is never called "the Less." The word probably describes his stature.

² John xiv. 22.

and Philip and Andrew only two or three incidents are narrated, some of which have little bearing on their history or character. We are enabled indeed to see deep into the hearts of Simon Peter and of Judas Iscariot, and the figure of John stands out clear to us, not only in the Gospel story, but in his own writings, and in the subsequent history and tradition of the Church. But of James the son of Zebedee we have little told us, except that, with Peter and John—and to a lesser degree Andrew—he belonged to the innermost circle, the ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι, of our Lord's disciples. In this capacity the first three alone were admitted into His immediate presence at the raising of the daughter of Jairus, at the Transfiguration, and in the Garden of Gethsemane. But in the three *special* incidents with which St. James is connected in the Gospels, he is associated with his brother John. John was the younger brother, yet greater prominence is accorded to him as being especially "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and as having been marked out earlier for the ranks of the Apostolate. It is a remarkable fact that in his own Gospel he never mentions his elder brother by name; though this may be due to the same sublime reticence which made him pass over the name of his mother,¹ and only speak of himself by periphrasis and in the third person.

It would be very interesting to know the extent to which the Apostles were drawn from the immediate families of Christ's own relatives, but unfortunately we are left to conjecture. The early tradition of the Christian Church was to a great extent fragmentary and anecdotal, and we are only able to arrive at possible or probable hypotheses on many subjects of which we would fain have known more. Our difficulties are further increased by the astonishing paucity of names among the Jews of the poorer classes at this epoch. There seem to have been only a few dozen

¹ John xix. 25, compared with Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1; Matt. xxvii. 56.

names in common use, and those who bore them had to be distinguished from each other by patronymics or descriptive adjectives. Even in the little group of Twelve Apostles there were two Simons, and two Judes, and two Jameses ; and besides these there was another James, another Simon, another Jude among "the brethren of the Lord."¹ In the same narrow circle there were also three Maries, and three or four who bore the name of Joseph and Joses. Perhaps however it was by the express purpose of Providence that we were left in ignorance about the mere personal biographies of the earliest followers of our Lord. We were meant to draw the lesson that they were less than nothing in comparison with Him. What, after all, are the saints ? They are still but mortal men, "inspirati a Deo, sed tamen homines." "They are," said Luther, "but sparkling drops of the nightdew on the head of the Bridegroom, scattered about His hair." Even the deep silence of the Gospels concerning them has not prevented them from being elevated into objects of adoration throughout a great part of Christendom. How much would the danger have been increased if they had been permitted to occupy a larger space in the Gospel record !

The notion that "*brethren*" means "*cousins*," and that the word "*brethren*" is misleadingly and invariably used when "*cousins*" might have been used with equal ease and greater accuracy, may now be regarded as an exploded fiction, invented mainly by the casuistry of St. Jerome with the aid of an apocryphal gospel, and practically abandoned even by its inventor as soon as it had served its immediate controversial purpose. Whatever "the brethren of the Lord" may have been, it is superfluously clear from the Gospels themselves that they were *not* among the number of the Apostles.² On the other hand, James and John were,

¹ Matt. xiii. 55.

² Matt. xii. 46 ; Mark iii. 31 ; Luke viii. 19. To an unprejudiced mind, which

almost beyond the possibility of doubt, the first cousins of the Lord, since Salome was the sister of the Virgin Mary.¹ Nor is it impossible that four of the remaining ten stood in the same or a similar relation to Him. For tradition—in spite of the difficulty that two sisters will then have borne the same name²—persistently holds that Mary the wife of Klopas was another sister of the Virgin; that though Cleopas is a shortened form of Cleopater,³ it was yet used as a Greek synonym for Chalpai, Clopas, or Alphæus; and that Alphæus was a brother of Joseph. If that tradition be correct, Matthew and his twin brother Thomas and James the Little, being sons of Mary and Alphæus, were also first cousins of Jesus; and Jude the son of James (unless this be *another* James, which does not seem likely) was His first cousin once removed.⁴ The previous relationship in which these Galilæan youths stood to our Lord, the fact that they must thus have known or heard of Him in earlier years, throws light on the instantaneous enthusiasm with which some of them were ready to accept His call.

James does not seem to have been among the multitudes who streamed to the preaching of the Baptist; or, if he did, his presence on the banks of the Jordan is not mentioned in any of the records. It is probable that the necessities of earning his bread, and of aiding his father Zebedee in his

refuses to be misled by the fatal facility of ecclesiastical casuistry, John vii. 5 is decisive on this question.

¹ Four women, not three, are mentioned in John xix. 25. The Peshito even inserts "and" before "Mary the wife of Klopas."

² This difficulty would not be in any case insuperable, as there are certainly historic instances of the same thing; and it would be all the more likely to occur in a country which laboured under such a sparseness of appellatives.

³ Luke xxiv. 18.

⁴ See Matt. x. 3; Mark ii. 14, iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13. But who was Joses? Mary is not only called "the mother of James and Joses" (Mark xv. 40), and "the mother of James" (Luke xxiv. 10), but simply "the mother of Joses" (Mark xv. 47). Joses therefore must have been exceedingly well known in the group of early disciples. It is a painful illustration of the extreme fragmentariness of our record that we know absolutely nothing about him. He is not even mentioned in Christian traditions.

precarious trade of a fisherman at Capernaum, may have detained him in Galilee. It is known from the Talmud that there was a regular sale at Jerusalem for the fish caught in the Lake of Galilee, and this may have necessitated the occasional residence of the younger brother at the Holy City, where we are told that he—alone of the Apostles—had a house or lodging, and where he was known to the servants of the High Priest.¹

Zebedee, Zabadja or Zabdîa, since he had a boat of his own and hired servants, seems to have been in more prosperous circumstances than his partners Simon and Andrew.² But when Jesus called the sons of Zebedee to leave all and follow Him, without a moment's hesitation they left the boat, and the nets, and the hired servants, and their father, to become the close and constant attendants on the ministry of Jesus. With Him they stood the storm, and the sultry heat of the Plain of Gennesareth, and the homelessness, and the days and nights of incessant labour and anxiety, and the taunts, and the pressing crowds, and afterwards the wanderings in heathen lands, the flight, the concealments, the anathemas of Pharisees and Priests. Such self-sacrifice shows their heroic faith; but their instant obedience would have been unnatural and unaccountable if St. John had not already heard the witness of the Baptist, and been present at the miracle of Cana, and perhaps in the early scenes at Jerusalem. James had doubtless also known something of that sinless childhood at Nazareth which was "like the flower of roses in the spring of the year, and lilies by the watercourses," and had heard much from his younger brother of "the Lamb of God that taketh

¹ John xix. 27, xviii. 15. This not improbable conjecture has been facetiously characterized by flippant critics as a suggestion that St. John was "a fishmonger." The supposed irreverence lies only in the insincerity and hopeless conventionality of those who are incapable of seeing that there is nothing more incongruous in the notion that an Apostle *sold* fish at Jerusalem than that an Apostle *caught* fish at Gennesareth.

² Mark i. 20.

away the sin of the world." His heart had been already prepared, both by spiritual influences and by the leadings of providential circumstance, to obey the call which transformed him from a young fisherman of the inland lake to be a leader among the Apostles, to have Churches dedicated to his honour in barbarous islands of northern seas of which he had never so much as heard the name, and to become the patron-saint of a chivalrous nation by the Pillars of the West.¹ Strange life, strange death, strange glory—glory greater than that of earth's kings and conquerors—for the poor Galilæan boy who had once played on the bright sands of Bethsaida, thinking to live a life of safe and happy obscurity "beneath the Syrian blue," dreaming in no wise of the destinies to come! In the miraculous draught of fishes after the night spent in fruitless toil he saw the proof that the hour had come in which Jesus should manifest Himself to the world²; and losing his life that he might find it, he left the little boat in which he had so often drawn out the fish from life to death to enter into that other little boat of Christ's infant Church, wherein, amid the tossing of far fiercer storms, he was to be a fisher of men.

His task began at once. Very soon after the first year—the bright Galilæan spring and dawn of Christ's ministry—St. James must have become well aware that the call of Christ meant a lifelong sacrifice; that it involved poverty and hatred; that he would often be obliged to face peril and malediction, and perhaps to die at last, not happy with children's faces round his bed, but amid the execration of the religious authorities of his day, by the hand of the executioner, as a man charged with sedition, heresy, and crime. And yet how infinitely was he the gainer! Who would change the lot of the Apostles, with its persecutions

¹ St. Jago of Compostella.

² Luke v. 1-11; comp. Mark i. 16-20, Matt. iv. 18-22.

and its hundredfold reward, for that of the rich young ruler who made "the great refusal"?

"The worst of miseries
Is when a nature framed for noblest things
Condemns itself in youth to petty joys,
And sore athirst for air breathes scanty life,
Gasping from out the shallows. The life *they* chose
Breathed high, and saw a full-arched firmament."

Yet it may save us from many *à priori* hypotheses and errors if we observe the curious and significant fact, that—apart from the incidental mention of his name as having been present on certain solemn occasions—in each of the three events in which St. James becomes for a moment prominent together with his brother, his conduct is marked by reprehension rather than approval. The blame was infinitely tender, yet it was distinctly blame. A man's goodness, a man's self-sacrifice, does not make him in the smallest degree infallible. It gives him no immunity from error, either in opinion or in practice. Because the Gospels are true and faithful, therefore the Apostles are not represented to us as faultless, nor is the language used respecting them like that of modern biographies, the language of unbroken eulogy. In all the stately and splendid picture gallery of saintly lives which Scripture presents to us we find that One was sinless, and One alone. The Apostles were holy and noble men; but they set themselves forth to us as often dull of understanding, jealous, narrow, impatient, lacking (as we all are) in perfect charity. Peter denies his Lord, and Thomas doubts, and, in the hour of His deepest need, all the disciples—even James, even the disciple whom Jesus loved—forsook Him and fled. Great was their work, eternal their reward, beautiful even their stormy impetuosity as "Sons of Thunder," in that cluster of young life which Jesus gathered round Him. Yet their life too was only a beginning and a setting forth, not a finishing.

Let us take the three sentences addressed to these two brothers by their Lord.

Luke ix. 55: "*Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.*"

Matthew xx. 22: "*Ye know not what ye ask.*"

Mark xiv. 41: "*Sleep on now, and take your rest.*"

We see at once that the three sentences, deep as was their gentleness, were three reproofs.

I. James and John had to unlearn the spirit of intolerance. Intolerance is sometimes represented as a virtue, and as a beautiful proof of flaming zeal; while tolerance, and comprehensiveness, and the readiness to make allowance are often condemned, especially by priests and the supporters of party religionism, as proofs of indifference and coldness. The lesson which Christ taught was invariably the reverse of this; only, in most ages of the Church, unhappily, many have not guided themselves by the words and example of Christ, but by their own party interests, perverted texts, and fierce traditions.

The rude and fanatical people of the frontier village of Engannim had refused to receive our Lord, because they were Samaritans, and His face was as though He would go to Jerusalem. This inhospitable rejection involved direct insult, as well as painful discomfort; and in that very country Elijah was recorded to have twice called down fire from heaven to avenge an insult far more excusable. Immediately the Sons of Thunder ask Christ if they may call down fire from heaven to punish these insolent villagers, even as Elijah did. They want to perform, in their own persons, a violent and exterminating miracle. It is the voice of the inquisitor, the voice of the partisan, the voice of religious hatred. It was the voice of Torquemada; the voice of Innocent III. and Arnold of Citeaux; the voice of Calvin; the voice of John Knox; the voice of Gardiner and Bonner; the voice of Philip II. and Alva; the voice of

sects and partisans—not the voice of Christ. Two words for themselves; one for Christ; none at all for the poor wretches, innocent and guilty alike, whom, for God's glory and their own, they want to consume. "*Even as Elias did.*" There we see a little touch of shame as to their request. Merciless anger and personal indignation justify themselves, as usual in such cases, with a real or supposed Scripture precedent.¹ There have always been adepts in the art of murdering the spirit of Scripture by its own dead letter. Popes quoted Scripture when they wanted to exterminate the opponents whom they called heretics; and Crusaders, when they waded bridle-deep in blood; and Romanists, when they burnt Protestants; and Jesuits, when they plotted to get kings assassinated; and the clergy, when they preached the Divine rights of despotism; and slave-owners, when, with the approval of countless clerical bibliolaters, they stole men from Africa, and kept them in bitter bondage. But Christ, with Divine wisdom, set aside their Scripture precedent as worse than valueless, as a pernicious anachronism. He tells them that the Elijah-spirit is not the Christ-spirit. The fire of wrath and destruction is in God's hands, not in the polluted hands of erring and feeble men. Fire is the only element in which Christ wrought no miracle. It is the brambles and bramble-men whose voices are most full of it, and they have used it chiefly against the cedars of Lebanon. But Jesus rebuked the two erring and vehement brothers, and said, "Ye know not of what spirit ye are. For the Son of man is not come"—as the representatives of the Church have so often and so fatally supposed—"to destroy men's lives, but to save."²

¹ It is clear that the passage has been tampered with, probably in more than one direction, by ecclesiastical bias. These words are omitted in N B, L, E, etc.

² This glorious utterance is omitted in N, A, B, C. There were scribes so ignorant and so steeped in the Elijah-spirit of persecution as to regard it as "dangerous."

II. Nor was the lesson of intolerance the only lesson which these two great Apostles had to unlearn. They had also to be purged from the secret religious selfishness from which all intolerance springs.

The incident occurred at a later stage of the great journey, after Jesus had taken refuge for a time from the ban of His enemies at the little village Ephraim. He only left it when, from its conical hill, he saw the Galilæan pilgrims beginning to stream down the Jordan valley towards Jerusalem. He had been walking in front of His disciples in the transfiguration of majestic sorrow, when He beckoned them to Him, and for the first time revealed to them the awful fact that He should be, not only mocked and scourged, but—the crowning horror—that He should be *crucified*. It was at that most inopportune moment that, instigated by her sons, the fond mother Salome mysteriously came to Him with them, and asks as a favour that they may sit at His right hand and His left in His kingdom. Jesus gently bore with the error and ambitious selfishness of the young men whom He loved, knowing that in their blindness they had asked for that position which, five days afterwards, should be occupied in shame and anguish by the two crucified robbers. “*Ye know not what ye ask,*” He said. Heaven is not a heaven of the selfish, ambitious, exclusive sort. There are no beggings and schemings there, no selfish jostlings and elbowings in the press, no competitive comparisons of which has done the maximum of service on the minimum of grace. There no one wonders why this man succeeds, or envies because another has been rewarded. There the highest and the lowest are all equally happy, because all are in full accord with the will of God.

“Frate, la nostra volontà queta
La Virtù di Carità, che fa volerne
Sol quel ch’avenno, e d’altro non chi asseta.

Se desiassimo esser più superne
 Foran discordi gli nostri disiri
 Dal voler di colui che qui ne cerne.

Chiaro mi fu allor, com' ogni dove
 In cielo è Paradiso, e sì la grazia
 Del sommo ben d' un modo non vi piove."¹

The ten, when they heard the request of the two brothers, had great indignation among themselves. They too wanted *their* thrones and places of distinction. But Jesus, who was patient because eternal, only taught the two poor disciples that His cup and His baptism were far different from what they supposed. And they, rising in their fall, showed themselves no less ready to taste His cup of bitterness and to partake of His baptism of fire. But the painful discipline did not come till they had been more trained to bear it.

III. St. James was indeed the first martyr of the Apostles, as St. John was their last survivor. We catch the last glimpse of him in the Gospels first sleeping and sharing in the gentle rebuke, "What, could ye not watch one hour?" then, with the rest, flying from his forsaken Lord.

"What should wring this from thee?' ye laugh and ask.
 What wrung it? Even a torchlight and a noise,
 The sudden Roman faces, violent hands,
 And fear of what the Jews might do! Just that,
 And it is written, 'I forsook and fled':
 There was my trial, and it ended thus.
 Ay, but my soul had gained its truth, could grow:
 Another year or two—what little child,
 What tender woman that had seen no least
 Of all my sights, but barely heard them told,

¹ Dante, *Paradiso* iii. 70, *seq.* "Brother, a virtue of Charity sets at rest our will, which makes us wish that only which we have, and lets us not thirst for aught else. If we desired to be more on high, our desires would be out of harmony with the will of Him who distributes us here. . . . It was clear to me then how everywhere in Heaven is Paradise, even if the grace of the highest Good falls not there in one fashion" (A. J. Butler's translation).

Who did not grasp the cross with a glad laugh,
Or wrap the burning robe round, thanking God?"

But this was his last recorded imperfection. In the Acts of the Apostles we find James named first, before even Peter and John, though he afterwards became less prominent in the popular recollection than the Apostle of Love, for he is described later on as "James the brother of John." We read no more of him till fourteen years later, and then we see nothing but the flash of a sword. Herod Agrippa, being but an alien usurper, supported mainly by the swords of Rome, is anxious to please the Jews. He knows that he cannot do so more effectually than by putting to death a leading Christian. And so "he slew James the brother of John with the sword." *Ἀνείλε μαχαίρᾳ*—just two words, and no more, suffice to narrate the martyrdom of the first of the Apostles, and, what is very remarkable, of the *only* Apostle whose death is recorded. How St. Peter died, how St. Paul died, how St. John died, how any one of the rest of the Twelve died, we simply do not know. We do not know how they were martyred, nor even—except by vague and late tradition—whether any of them, except the Apostles of the Circumcision and of the Uncircumcision, were martyred at all. St. James has the signal honour of being the only Apostle whose martyrdom is recorded in the Sacred Book.

But what "Acts of Martyrdom" are these! How brief, how quiet in their solemnity, how entirely unsurrounded by any blaze of miracles or of superhuman sanctity in the sufferer! The story of tradition, recorded by Clement of Alexandria and preserved in Eusebius, may or may not be true—that, on his way to execution, he forgave and converted his accuser, and that when this man desired to die with James, the Apostle looked at him for a little time, then kissed him, and said, "Peace to thee, my brother." But if the story be true, Scripture, at any rate, does not narrate it.

Scripture differs greatly from common biographies. It is indifferent to earthly glories and death-bed scenes. It would seem to say to us—

“Why do ye toil to register your names
On icy pillars which soon melt away?
True honour is not here.”

There is, as I have said elsewhere, a spiritual fitness in the lonely, slightly recorded death-scene of the Son of Thunder. There is a deep lesson in the fact that, meekly and silently, in utter self-renouncement, with no visible consolation, with no elaborate eulogy, amid no pomp of circumstance, with not even a recorded burial, he should perish, first of the faithful few to whom, in answer to his request to sit at his Lord's right hand, had been uttered that warning and tender prophecy, that he should drink of the cup and be baptized with the baptism of his Saviour. Nor was the day far distant when the Herods and High Priests would be forced to say of him: “We fools accounted his life madness, and his end to be without honour. How is he numbered among the children of God, and his lot is among the saints!”

F. W. FARRAR.

EARLY CHRISTIAN MONUMENTS IN PHRYGIA:
A STUDY IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

IV.

MULTITUDES flocked to listen to the ministrations of Aberkios from the neighbouring provinces, Greater Phrygia, Asia, Lydia, and Caria. He restored sight to a noble lady named Phrygella, and afterwards to three old women of the country. Observing that the country stood in need of medicinal baths, to which invalids might resort for the cure of their ailments, he fell on his knees beside a river near the

city, and prayed : immediately a peal of thunder was heard from a clear sky, and fountains of hot water sprang from the earth. The form in which this tale is told owes its origin probably to a reader of the Odes of Horace, or of the Greek original which Horace has imitated in the 34th Ode of the First Book, where the sceptic, who maintained the scientific explanation of thunder as due to mere physical action among the clouds, is converted to believe that it is due to the direct action of Jupiter, by the occurrence of thunder and lightning in a clear sky. Such a touch, like the white garments of the worshippers in the opening scene, seems to betray some familiarity with ancient literature ; and incidentally it illustrates what I have said in a preceding article as to the educating influence of the earlier form of Christianity in Phrygia. Also the multitudes from the provinces point perhaps to a reader of the Acts of the Apostles, chap. ii.

Strong belief in the curative and prophylactic properties of mineral springs seems in all ages to have characterized, and still continues to characterize, the natives of Asia Minor. All summer these baths of Hierapolis are still thronged by visitors, many coming from a great distance, some to be cured of ailments, others hoping to prevent them by timely use of the medicinal waters. Two of the provinces of Asia Minor, Phrygia and Galatia, derived their distinctive title *Salutaris* from the number of hot salutary springs within their bounds. The origin of these healing fountains was naturally attributed to some beneficent divinity by the pagans, and by the Christians to the great saint of the district, just as the origin of the lake of Diocæsareia was in the legend just quoted ascribed to the prayers of St. Artemon. Before the true site of Hierapolis¹ had been discovered, the Berlin geographer, Professor

¹ Different from the greater Hierapolis, described above, beside *Laodiceia*. There are hot springs at both Phrygian cities of the name.

Kiepert, argued from its name that it must be in the neighbourhood of some hot spring. Hierapolis, "the Holy City," is from its very name a city of religious sanctity, and all the great pagan sanctuaries of Asia Minor were situated in places where some striking natural phenomenon revealed the immediate power and presence of the deity, who ruled and through his prophets advised his people.

The father of deceit, the devil himself, now sought in the form of a woman to get a blessing from the saint; but the latter knew him, and turning hastily away, bruised his ankle against a stone, and gave cause of boasting to the evil one, who delights only in doing injury. The devil then leaped upon a youth of the company, and handled him in miserable wise, till Aberkios pitied him; whereupon the devil left him, threatening that he would make the saint go to Rome. This most puerile incident is introduced to lead up to the central event in the life of the Phrygian saint, his visit to Rome. The fact was known, and some motive had to be found for it consistent with the childish fancy of a miracle-mongering age. The real reason which led to the wide travels of Aberkios is unknown to us; it is probable that it was simply the desire to visit the central Church of the Roman and the Christian world in Rome, and the earliest seats of the Church in Syria, and thus to strengthen the connexion between the provincial Church of Phrygia and the Church Catholic.

I have here anticipated slightly in assuming the historical character of the travels of Aberkios: the reasons which prove that he did visit Rome and Syria for religious purposes will be given below. I anticipate in order to bring out more clearly at this point the way in which the legend grows out of the real facts. The fact that Aberkios went to Rome and to Syria was recorded and remembered. Popular tradition demanded a reason why a man from the interior of Phrygia undertook such journeys; and in ac-

cordance with the character of popular legend the reason must be supernatural. The devil forced him to go to Rome, but his success only produced a more signal manifestation of the saint's miraculous power. When we remember the character of the Montanist movement—Montanus the representative of the old native spirit in religion and in Church government; his opponents, among whom Aberkios was one of the earliest leaders, bent on consolidating and organizing the Church, and on converting the former merely personal ascendancy and authority of Church leaders and apostles into the titled and regulated authority of the officials of a hierarchical system—we shall see that the journeys of the saint must have played an important part in forming his policy and in making him the champion of organization and the Church Catholic against the distinctively national Phrygian and separatist tendency of Montanism.

The devil then went to Rome, and took possession of the Princess Lucilla, daughter of Marcus Aurelius, and betrothed to the younger emperor Verus. Verus had gone to the East to conduct a war against the Parthian king Vologeses, and it had been arranged that on his return Aurelius should meet him at Ephesus, and the marriage should be celebrated there in the temple of Artemis. This last detail is suggested by the Christian ceremonial of marrying in church, and is entirely out of harmony with pagan marriage customs. In the whole of this part of the story there is a distinct effort made to accommodate the incidents to actual history. The writer was fairly well read in the history of the second century, but not sufficiently master of the subject to avoid various inconsistencies and chronological contradictions, which need not be here particularized. But even where he is most successful in painting the historical background, he introduces occasional details, like the marriage in a temple, which betray the habits of a later age. Most of this episode gives the im-

pression of learned invention by the composer of the biography, and not of free popular mythology. Probably the only point which belongs to popular tradition is that the saint was made to go to Rome by the wiles of the devil, and there cured the princess. The introduction of the princess is due to a misunderstanding of the real recorded facts that underlie the myth; for the Church is called in the record "the Princess."

Every means was tried to cure the princess. The priests of Rome and Italy, the diviners of Etruria, could not exorcise the demon. We note that the author was educated enough to know the fame of the Etruscans in divination: another detail to mark his character. The devil declared openly that he would not come out unless Aberkios, bishop of the city of the Hierapolitans in Lesser Phrygia, came to him. The emperor at last sent two messengers to fetch Aberkios. The letter which he sent by their hands, addressed to Euxenianus Poplio, governor of Lesser Phrygia, contains one more touch of the inaccurate learning of the author of the biography. It refers to the terrible earthquake at Smyrna, and to the relief which the emperor had given to the sufferers. The words are probably written by some person who had read the petition of Aristides to the two emperors on behalf of Smyrna, and his panegyric after the relief was bestowed, but who was ignorant that the earthquake took place in A.D. 180, only a few months before the death of Marcus Aurelius. Aristides refers to the two emperors who relieved Smyrna, *viz.* Marcus and Commodus; the author of the biography apparently understood them to be Marcus and Verus.¹

The messengers set out with all speed, and made the

¹ The inference which I once drew ("The Tale of St. Abercius," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1892, p. 347) from the fact that Euxenianus was also in authority in Smyrna, cannot be sustained, and is rightly rejected by Bishop Lightfoot, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, i., p. 484.

journey from Rome to Brindisi, about 400 miles, in two days!¹ The writer was learned enough to know that Brindisi was the usual harbour on the route from Rome to the East, but not learned enough to be aware of the distance. Hence they took ship, and on the seventh day reached the Peloponnesus, whence they travelled with the imperial post horses to Byzantium. The writer knows that Byzantium was the old name of Constantinople, but does not know the road from Brindisi to Constantinople: imperial messengers would have crossed in one day from Brindisi to Dyrrhacchium, and then ridden post along the Egnatian Way by Salonica, a very much shorter land journey. But any reader who knows the geography of the Mediterranean lands, or who looks at a map, will ask why, if the messengers are in a hurry, they should go round by Constantinople. Had the writer lived before the time of Diocletian, he would have made his messengers follow the usual Roman route, across the *Ægean* Sea to Ephesus, and thence along the great eastern highway by Laodiceia and Apameia. But he lived at a time when all roads in the East led to Constantinople, and all imperial messengers travelled to and from Constantinople; and he makes the characters of his story travel accordingly. From Constantinople onwards he knows his ground, and describes it accurately; the messengers go along the imperial road by Nicomedeia to Synnada, the capital of the province. Arrived at Synnada, they have to leave the main route and take a cross-country path, over a lofty, precipitous ridge of volcanic rock, by which they require guides to conduct them. About the ninth hour they reached Hierapolis and met Aberkios as they were entering the city. The writer throughout shows a great liking for the ninth hour,

¹ Clodius boasted of his speed in coming from the Straits of Messina to Rome in seven days, Cato from Hydruntum to Rome in five days; the distance is a little more than that to Brindisi.

and makes several of the important incidents of the tale take place then. At that hour Aberkios was wont, after spending the day in preaching and teaching, to return home to pray. The messengers asked the way, and Aberkios replied by asking what was their business. One of the messengers, angry at his presumption in questioning a royal official, lifted his hand to strike the saint with his riding whip, but the hand remained outstretched and paralysed, until Aberkios, with his wonted compassion, restored it to health. Aberkios promised to meet the messengers after forty days at the harbour of Rome, and they returned alone, while he took a carriage, and drove down to the harbour of Attaleia, on the southern coast, where he took ship for Rome. The miraculous way in which he provisioned himself and in which his servant was obliged against his own will to behave honestly, is too puerile for repetition: it is obviously due to vulgar popular mythology. The road which the saint took is exactly the one which would recommend itself to a native. Three days after Aberkios the messengers reached the port of Rome, which the writer understands to be actually beside the city: the saint was awaiting them as they landed. They land at a harbour, though it is implied that they returned by the road along which they had previously travelled. The emperor was absent from Rome, on an expedition against the barbarians, who had crossed the Rhine (here we again note the writer's historical knowledge), and Aberkios was brought into the presence of the Empress Faustina. He had the princess brought into the Hippodrome, by which the writer perhaps means the Circus Maximus, but more probably he knew Constantinople and its Hippodrome, and transferred the detail to Rome. Here he ordered the devil who possessed her to leave her, and to take up an altar which stood in the Hippodrome and set it down beside the southern gate of Hierapolis. This same altar was afterwards used as the

tombstone of the saint, and we may gather from this story that the saint was buried by the side of the road which issued through the southern gate of the city. The form of an altar is, as I mentioned in a preceding article, very common among the Phrygian gravestones, and there can be no doubt that the whole story about conveying the altar from the Roman Hippodrome is suggested by the monument, in the shape of an altar, which stood above the grave of the saint. I shall below mention the exact dimensions and shape of the gravestone, a considerable fragment of which is lying before me as I write.

Aberkios refused to accept for himself any recompense from the grateful empress, but asked her to build a bathing-house over the hot springs beside his native city, and to bestow a yearly largess of 3,000 bushels of corn on its inhabitants. This largess continued to be given until the time of the Emperor Julian, by whom it was abrogated. If I am correct in my view as to the date when the biography was composed, it is most probable that some public benefaction to the people of Hierapolis did really exist in the fourth century, and was really confiscated by the Emperor Julian (A.D. 361-63). A writer about A.D. 400 could hardly invent entirely without foundation an incident which belonged to a period well within the memory of his contemporaries. I believe therefore that the existence of a benefaction to the Christians of a Phrygian city, which had lasted some considerable time before A.D. 363, is proved by this biography. In inscriptions 13 and 20 examples of such benefactions on a small scale were given.

After remaining some time in Rome, Aberkios was ordered by God to visit Syria, and the Empress Faustina, yielding to his request, ordered a ship to be prepared for him. A voyage of seven days brought him from the port of Rome to Syria: this impossible statement, compared with the statement quoted above as to the length of the

voyage from Brindisi to the Peloponnesus, illustrates the writer's utter ignorance of geography beyond the bounds of Asia Minor. The saint visited Antioch and Apameia, and crossing the Euphrates made a round of the Churches near Nisibis and through the whole of Mesopotamia. Large sums of money were pressed on him by the Syrian Christians, but were persistently declined by him. At last, on the proposal of a rich and noble Syrian, named Barchasanes, the title of Isapostolos, "Equal of the Apostles," was formally bestowed on him. He then returned through the two provinces Cilicia and Lycaonia and Pisidia¹ to Synnada, and thence to his own home. On the toilsome road between Synnada and Hierapolis he sat down on a stone to rest during the heat of a summer day. Some rustics near him were winnowing their corn in the same way as is still customary in the country, throwing it up in the air and allowing the breeze to carry away the chaff. The brisk northerly wind, which blows on the plateau almost every day for great part of the summer, enables this to be easily done. The chaff was borne by the wind into the face of the saint, who, instead of changing his position, asked the labourers to stop their work, and when they, naturally enough, refused to do so, lulled the breeze and thus compelled them to stop. The rustics employed their enforced leisure in making a meal. Aberkios begged of them a little water, but they refused it with rustic jeers, which after his conduct seem to us not wholly inexcusable. Aberkios then afflicted them with insatiable appetite, which continues to be the case until the present day. The writer does not clearly explain his meaning; but probably some rustic joke about the enormous appetite of the inhabitants

¹ The details are accurate. There were two provinces of Cilicia, Prima (capital Tarsus) and Secunda (capital Anazarbus). Lycaonia was separated from Pisidia about 372. Aberkios would, by the usual route, traverse these provinces and no others.

of some village between Synnada and Hierapolis has given rise to the legend. The picture of the saint sitting on the stone and jeered by the rustics is so obviously modelled on that of Demeter sitting on the Agelastos Petra, "the Stone of Mourning," and ridiculed by the people of Eleusis, that we may probably infer that the same tale was related about the Cybele of Hierapolis as about the Demeter of Eleusis, and that Aberkios has inherited the local legend. But how utterly vulgarised is that pathetic legend in its new form !

The only other incident which is recorded about Aberkios is his production of a spring of drinking water on the top of a high mountain. It must be possible to find whether this fountain exists. I think that a search might discover it, and prove in one further instance that real natural phenomena were popularly accounted for by the prayers of the local saint. Then his approaching death was announced to him in a dream, and he prepared his tomb, engraving his epitaph on the altar which the devil had brought from the Hippodrome in Rome.

The mere recital of the useless, meaningless, and often absurd miracles, and of the historical, chronological, and geographical impossibilities in this legend, is sufficient to show the utterly unhistorical character of the biography. There is a tone of vulgarity and rusticity about it which gives it a rather low place in the class of religious romances to which it belongs. It might fairly be discarded as an unprofitable fabrication, as Tillemont has done. But the epitaph which is given, in a very bad text, at the end of the legend is a remarkable document. Several authorities, such as Bishop Lightfoot and Cardinal Pitra, caught the ring of a genuine second century Christian document in it, and through their remarks¹ it began to attract some notice.

¹ Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 54; Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, iii., p. 553; Duchesne, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, July, 1883, p. 1; Di Rossi most recently and elaborately in *Inscript. Christ. Urbis Romæ*, ii., p. 15.

But it was in very suspicious company. Few spend sufficient time in so habituating their ear to the tone of second century work, as to be able to appreciate the ring of truth in it, and probably the majority would have declined to accept as historical a document which was enshrined in such an obviously unhistorical and late biography. Moreover Aberkios is said to be Bishop of Hierapolis. Now precisely at the time when the biography declares him to have been Bishop of Hierapolis, we know on certain authority that Papias and Apollinaris successively were bishops. The legend makes the imperial messengers go from Synnada to Hierapolis in one day, but Synnada is several long days' journey from Hierapolis, and the principle has been laid down above that fidelity in local features is one of the tests of the better class of religious legend. Attempts which were made to evade these difficulties proved vain, and mere faith in the genuineness of the epitaph would not have convinced the world. But when part of the very altar on which the epitaph was engraved is now in Aberdeen, where it can be examined by all, and when it is found to be unmistakably a second century monument, and finally when the letters on the stone give the true text, which had been corrupted beyond the reach of emendation in all manuscripts of the biography, doubt is at an end.

The biography states that the altar was equal in length and breadth. It can now from actual measurement be said that the altar was one foot nine inches in length and the same in breadth. The total height cannot be determined, but if, as is common, the lower mouldings were exactly of the same dimensions as the upper, the altar must have been two feet eight inches high. The inscription was engraved on three sides of the monument; on the fourth side was a crown, just as on the monument of Aristeas at Acmonia, which was described in a preceding article, No. 13. The first six lines of the epitaph were engraved on the side

opposite to that which bears the crown, the next eleven lines were engraved on the left side, and the remaining five lines on the right side. There is room in the panel on each side for eleven lines, and the reason why so little was engraved on the first and most important side, which is now entirely lost, must have been that symbols or sculpture of some kind occupied part of the available space.

In addition to discovering the original epitaph, which mentions the chief facts in the life of the saint, the systematic exploration conducted by the Exploration Fund has also removed the historical and geographical difficulties which were stated on the preceding page. It has shown that there were two cities named Hierapolis, one the more famous city of the Lycus valley, where Apollinarius was bishop in the time of Marcus Aurelius, the other in the Phrygian Pentapolis, a few miles west of Synnada, but separated from that city by a lofty range of rugged mountains, so that it is a good day's journey of eight or nine hours from the one city to the other. About two or three miles south of this latter city is a fine series of hot sulphurous springs, on the bank of a small river, a tributary of the Mæander. The springs rise within fifty yards of the bank of the stream. Part of the gravestone of Aberkios is still built into the wall of one of the bathing houses, while a smaller part has been brought to this country during the last expedition organized by the Fund. It has been stated above that according to the biography the grave was outside of the southern gate of Hierapolis. This description of the locality shows how natural it was that monuments from the southern road should be carried to build the baths.

The epitaph of Avircius may be thus translated, correcting the text given in the biography by the epigraphic evidence :

23. *"Citizen of the select city, I have, while still living, made this (tomb), that I may have here before the eyes of men a place where to lay my body*

—I, who am named Avircius, a disciple of the spotless Shepherd, who on the mountains feedeth the flocks of His sheep and on the plains, who hath large eyes that see all things. For He was my teacher, teaching me the faithful writings,—He who sent me to Rome to behold the King, and to see the Queen ('Princess') that wears golden robes and golden shoes. And I saw there a people marked with a shining seal. And Syria's plain I saw and all its cities, even Nisibis, crossing the Euphrates; and everywhere I found fellow-worshippers. Holding Paul in my hands I followed, while Faith everywhere went in front, and everywhere set before me, as food, the Fish from the fountain, mighty, pure, which a spotless Virgin grasped. And this she (i.e. Faith) gave to the friends to eat at all times, having excellent wine, giving the mixed cup with bread. These words, I Avircius, standing by, ordered to be written: I was of a truth in my seventy-second year. When he sees this, let every one pray for him (i.e. Avircius) who thinks with him.¹ But no one shall place another in my grave; and, if he do, he shall pay 2,000 gold pieces to the Romans, and 1,000 gold pieces to my excellent fatherland Hierapolis."²

The importance of this document as a summary of faith and ritual in the second century has been shown briefly by

¹ I.e. who believes in the One Church, and abhors Montanus.

- ² ἐκλεκτῆς πόλεως ὁ πολεῖτης τοῦτ' ἐποίησα
ζῶν, ἡν' ἔχω φανερώς σώματος ἔνθα θέσιν,
οὐνομ' Ἀουέρκιος ὦν, ὁ μαθητὴς Ποιμένος ἀγνοῦ,
οὐρεσιν δὲ βόσκει προβάτων ἀγέλας πεδίοις τε,
5 ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ ἔχει μεγάλους καὶ πάνθ' ὁρώωντας·
οὗτος γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξε, [διδάσκων] γράμματα πιστά,
εἰς Ῥώμην δὲ ἐπεμψεν ἔμην βασιλῆαν ἀθρήσαι
καὶ βασιλίσσαν ἰδεῖν χρυσόστολον χρυσοπέδιλον·
λαὸν δ' εἶδον ἐκεῖ λαμπρὰν σφραγεῖδαν ἔχοντα·
10 καὶ Συρίης πέδον εἶδα καὶ ἄσπεα πάντα, Νίσιβιν,
Εὐφράτην διαβάς, πάντα δ' ἔσχον συνομήθεις·
Παῦλον ἔχων ἐπόμεν, Πίστις πάντῃ δὲ προήγε
καὶ παρέθηκε τροφὴν πάντῃ Ἰχθὺν ἀπὸ πηγῆς,
πανμεγέθη, καθάρην, ὃν ἐδράξατο Παρθένος ἀγνή,
15 καὶ τοῦτον ἐπέδωκε φίλοις ἔσθειν διὰ παντός,
οἶνον χρηστὸν ἔχουσα, κέρασμα διδοῦσα μετ' ἄρτου.
ταῦτα παρεστῶς εἶπον Ἀουέρκιος ὧδε γραφῆναι·
ἐβδομήκοστον ἔτος καὶ δεῦτερον ἦγον ἀληθῶς.
ταῦθ' ὁρώων εὖξαιθ' ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πᾶς ὁ συνφῶδς.
20 οὐ μέντοι τύμβῳ τις ἐμῷ ἑτερόν τινα θήσει,
εἰ δ' οὖν, Ῥωμαῖοις θήσει δισχέλια χρυσᾶ,
καὶ χρηστῇ πατρίδι Ἱεράπολι χεῖλια χρυσᾶ.

I am obliged to differ in a number of points from the text as given by Lightfoot and Di Rossi (who differ from each other also in various details). The chief variations are mentioned below.

Bishop Lightfoot in *THE EXPOSITOR*, January, 1885, p. 1 ff., and very elaborately by Comm. di Rossi in the preface to vol. ii. of his *Inscriptiones Christ. Urbis Romæ*. We have in it the writings of faith, the Church as queen in her golden attire, the central importance of the Roman Church, the seal of baptism, the Church of Syria, the intercommunion of the members of different Churches in different lands—all are associates of one Church and practise the same ritual—the importance of St. Paul's writings, faith as the guide of life, the holy sacrament of bread and wine as the body of Christ, Christ conceived by the spotless Virgin, Christ born afresh in the fountain of baptism,¹ and the name applied to Christ is the symbolical fish, the well-known anagram (of which this is one of the earliest known examples) of the initial letters, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ. The document is also interesting as an example of the sacred poetry of the second century, and it has been compared with the famous inscription of Autun, which was discovered in 1839. The latter is a much later document,² but the first six lines clearly belong to an early period (probably the same period as the epitaph of Avircius), and are merely reproduced by the composer of the epitaph proper. The remarkable similarity of tone and spirit in the two documents furnishes one further proof of the close relations between the Church of southern Phrygia and the Church of Gaul, to be placed alongside of the epistle of the Churches of Lyon and Vienne to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia, the Lyonnese martyr Alexander the Phrygian, etc.

The phrase in the second line, "before the eyes of men" (φανερῶς), shows the intention of the writer. The epitaph was intended to be the imperishable record, amid the

¹ Di Rossi aptly quotes a Byzantine hymn, Πηγὴ ὕδατος πηγὴν πνεύματος ἀνέλαβε.

² Di Rossi however seems to me to be quite right in arguing that it is in the style of A.D. 300, rather than of the fifth century.

most solemn and impressive surroundings, of the testimony of Avircius in favour of the one and indivisible Church catholic, and against the separatism and the nationalism of Montanus. During his life Avircius took care that he should continue after his death to preach the doctrine of unity, and to protest against the Montanists, even to the extent of refusing their prayers on his behalf: let them only who think with him pray for him.¹ This important word is preserved to us by the contemporary epigraphic evidence; and it is very unlucky that Di Rossi and Lightfoot have preferred the feeble reading of the MSS. to the decisive testimony of an inscription which will be quoted below. The phrase "in due time" (*καίρῳ*), loses all the individuality that suits the situation, and substitutes a commonplace platitude. The epitaph, as it has now been interpreted, belongs to the height of the Montanist controversy, and can hardly be dated later than A.D. 192, when the treatise against Montanism was dedicated to Avircius by one of his neighbours and friends. In respect of the date, I am glad to agree absolutely with the two high authorities whom I have just quoted, against Duchesne and Bonwetsch, who prefer a date about A.D. 215. The latest date then that can be assigned for the birth of Avircius is A.D. 120.

Before attempting to draw the conclusions that suggest themselves from the new evidence about the position and policy of Avircius, I shall put together here some remarks on the text of the document which is our chief authority.

Since the complete text of the epitaph of Avircius was published by me (*Academy*, Mar. 8th, 1884), other versions by Bishop Lightfoot and Comm. di Rossi have been published

¹ This bitter intolerance is paralleled by the treatise dedicated in 192 to Avircius, in which the anonymous author, a neighbouring presbyter, praises certain orthodox martyrs who refused, even in the immediate prospect of death, to have any communion with their Montanist fellow martyrs.

(THE EXPOSITOR, 1885, p. 11; *Ignat. Pol.*, i., p. 480; *Inscr. Christ. Urb. Rom.*, ii., preface). I regret to be unable to agree with the text as restored variously by these scholars, and in most points the text given in the *Academy* (in which I had the help of Mr. Bywater and Prof. Sanday) is I believe preferable. The recent texts proceed, if I may say so, on an uncritical principle; no attempt is in them made to explain the errors of text in the manuscripts, whereas the text as reconstituted must explain the origin of the errors. These errors are, I think, due partly to actual false readings of the monument (which the biographer acknowledges to have found difficulty in reading), and partly to attempts to explain and modernize the text, which caused the substitution of common forms for dialectic and poetic forms, and of marginal explanatory glosses for unusual expressions in the text. The rule then should be, that where any manuscript authority exists for a dialectic variety or unusual form, the presumption is that it was written by Avircius.

In the first place, as to the spelling of the name, all the three versions agree in accepting the authority of the MSS., and reading Ἀβέρκιος. The name however is Italian, as will be proved below. The Latin Avircius or Avercius was transliterated in Greek during the second century in accordance with universal practice Ἀουίρκιος or Ἀουέρκιος. During the third century, Greek β began to represent Latin *v*, and the two inscriptions 300–400 A.D. have Ἀβίρκιος. The saint must have written either Ἀουέρκιος or Ἀουίρκιος, and as all MSS. of the biography and all the Menæa, etc., quoted in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Oct. 22nd, p. 485 ff.), have Ἀβέρκιος, the biographer probably saw Ἀουέρκιος on the monument. I have however written Avircius on the authority of the treatise quoted by Eusebius, and of inscriptions 31, 32.

The chief variations which I think are needed from the text as constituted by Bishop Lightfoot are the following:

Line 2. *Καιρῷ* of the MSS. is falsely read from the stone ; the epitaph of Alexander gives *φανερ[ῶς]*, which as I have rendered seems to give also a better though less obvious sense. *Κερῷ* is an easy error for [*φα*]*νερῷ[ς]*.

3. For *εἶμι* I read *ὦν, ὁ* : the MSS. have *ὁ ὦν*, a transposition of some scribe ; *εἶμι* is a purely modern alteration.

4. *Οὔρεσι*, MSS. ; Lightfoot corrects to *ῥεσιν metri causa*. But the ordinary form *ῥεσιν* would never have been altered to the unusual and unmetrical *οὔρεσι*. Avircius wrote *οὔρεσιν* at the beginning of the line, in an order which was a favourite device with him (cf. 5, 7). A scribe restored the prose order of words, destroying the metre, and the modern editor eliminated the poetic form and restored the common form *ῥεσιν* for the sake of the metre.

5. *Καθορόωντας*, MSS. Avircius wrote *καὶ πάντα ὀρόωντας* ; a scribe, omitting *καί* accidentally, inserted it above the line, a most fruitful source of error in ancient MSS. It was then misplaced by the next copyist, and written *καθορόωντας*. Finally metre was restored by reading *πάντη*, which is twice used by Avircius. Lightfoot prefers *καθορώντας*.

6. There is a gap in this line : Cardinal Pitra restores *τὰ ζωῆς*, which gives an admirable sense, "the faithful writings of life" ; but it is perhaps too bold to introduce without any authority such an idea into the text. And how should such a reading have disappeared without leaving a trace ? I insert *διδάσκων*, which completes the sense, adds no new idea, and explains the omission, for the word is readily dropped by a scribe after *ἐδίδαξε*.

7. *Βασίλῃαν*, as Lightfoot rightly shows, was understood by the biographer, when he transcribed the epitaph, as a feminine in the sense of empress. Lightfoot also rightly maintains that a mystic and figurative sense for the passage was intended by Avircius. In both these points I was wrong in my first interpretation. But I still hold that such a writer as Avircius could not have written *βασίλῃαν* for

βασίλειαν, and repeated βασιλίσσαν in the next line in the sense of "queen." Moreover the rhythm, βασιλῆαν ἀθρήσαι καὶ βασιλίσσαν ἰδεῖν, clearly demands that the two clauses shall exactly balance each other. Βασιλῆαν then I still maintain to be a correct poetic variety of the accusative of βασιλεύς, to which many parallels can be quoted. What the mystic sense is (such as Lightfoot rightly requires) that lies in "the King" and "the Queen" whom Avircius went to Rome to see, I must leave to others to determine; but I may add that Lightfoot's text also fails to give a mystic sense to βασιλῆαν.

11. The correct text is suggested by Lightfoot in a note, but not given in his text. It is *συνομήθεις*. The word must have been misread on the stone. My original suggestion is wrong.

12. My restoration ἐπό[μην] is disliked by both Lightfoot and Di Rossi, but they confess themselves unable to discover anything better. They seem to understand Παῦλον ἔχων as "with Paul as my comrade," whereas I translate it "holding (the writings of) Paul in my hands," and thus I think the line has an unexceptionable sense. The antithesis ἐπόμην in penthemimeral cæsura and προῆγε at the end of the line is such a common device in hexameters as to justify itself in this case forthwith.

14. I cannot agree with Lightfoot in doubting the reference to the Virgin Mary.

18. ἐβδομήκοστον, with its scansion as a four-syllable word, is necessitated, and may be palliated by the slurring of the second syllable.

19. ὁ νοῶν followed by ὁ συνῳδος seems to be too awkward for the style of Avircius. I think the biographer falsely read N for P, and that the true text is, as I have given, ὁρόων. The phrase is then more characteristic of epitaphs, more vigorous in sense, and more on a level with the grammar of Avircius. ὁ συνῳδός Lightfoot takes in the

sense of Christian: this seems weak. It means "anti-montanist."

19. *εὔξαιτο ὑπὲρ Ἀβερκίου*, MSS. The epitaph wrote, in accordance with a most frequent usage in these documents, *ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ*; this was explained by a gloss *Ἀβερκίου*, which crept into the text and supplanted the pronoun. *ὑπὲρ μου*, as given by Lightfoot, is naturally and readily intelligible, and would not have led to any marginal explanation.

20. Lightfoot deserts the inscription of Alexander completely. Di Rossi, on the other hand, inflicts on Avircius a seven-foot line. It is to me inconceivable how the latter can attribute such a line to a writer capable of composing this fine epitaph. Alexander certainly gives a seven-foot line, but he was a half-educated native Phrygian: he found a somewhat poetic phrase *Ῥωμαίοις* in the text which he was copying, and substituted for it the regular technical phrase *Ῥωμαίων ταμίης*.

22. I refuse to attribute to the composer of this epitaph such a metrical enormity as *Ἱεροπόλει χεῖλια*. I have for years insisted on and quoted examples to prove the principle that *Ἱερόπολις* is the native Phrygian, Cappadocian, and Syrian name, but that wherever Greek education spread the true Greek form *Ἱερὰ Πόλις* takes its place. Thus Hierapolis is the invariable form in the Lycus valley,¹ which was thoroughly Græcised, and the city of Avircius always becomes Hierapolis in ecclesiastical documents. Avircius, a well educated man, used the Greek form, and in verse considered himself justified in forming a dative *πόλι*, or perhaps in using a vocative. He probably intended the single word *Ἱεράπολι*, and not the two words *Ἱερὰ Πόλι*. Alexander substituted the local name *Ἱεροπόλει*.

Di Rossi thinks that the biographer omitted the conclusion of the epitaph, containing the date and a salutation

¹ Except in one or two of the earliest coins, before it was completely penetrated by Greek education.

to the passers by. This is not probable. The date is supplied by the age of the writer, and the usual salutation is represented by the request for the prayers of the orthodox, which shows that *ὁρθόων* is required in order to correspond to the ordinary phraseology of epitaphs: "Let every orthodox person who sees this prove his orthodoxy by praying for him that is buried here."¹

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

VIII. THE GOSPEL OF REST (CHAP. IV.).

THE interest of an ordinary reader of our epistle is apt to flag at this point, in consequence of the obscurity overhanging the train of thought, and the aim of the whole passage relating to a "rest that remaineth." It helps to rescue the section from listless perusal to fix our attention on this one thought, that the Christian salvation is here presented under a third aspect as a rest, a sabbatism, a participation in the rest of God; the new view, like the two preceding, in which the great salvation was identified with lordship in the world to come and with deliverance from the power of the devil and the fear of death, being taken from the beginning of human history as narrated in the early chapters of Genesis.

One aim of the writer of the epistle in this part of his work was doubtless to enunciate this thought, and so to identify the gospel of Christ with the Old Testament gospel of rest. But his aim is not purely didactic, but

¹ The interpretation of Geraios suggested in the second of these papers must be abandoned, and the more obvious interpretation as member of *Gerousia* is to be preferred. The title occurs a third time in a Phrygian inscription at Hierapolis.

partly also, and even chiefly, parenetic. Doctrine rises out of-and serves the purpose of exhortation. The obscurity of the passage springs from the interblending of the two aims, the theoretical and the practical; which makes it difficult to decide whether the object of the writer is to prove that a rest really remains over for Christians, or to exhort them to be careful not to lose a rest, whose availability for them is regarded as beyond dispute. In the latter case one is apt to think it might have been better to have omitted vers. 2-10 and to have passed at once to ver. 12, where comes in the solemn statement concerning the word of God. As in the previous chapter he had asserted without proof, "whose house are we," why could our author not here also have contented himself with asserting, "which rest is ours, if we lose it not by unbelief, as did Israel of old," and adding, "let us therefore, one and all of us, be on our guard against such a calamity"? Would his exhortation not have gained in strength by being put in this brief, authoritative form, instead of being made to rest on an intricate process of reasoning?

As proof offered naturally implies doubt of the thing proved, it is a ready inference that the Hebrew Christians required to be assured that they had not come too late for participation in the rest promised to their fathers. Evidence of this has been found in the word *δοκῆ* (ver. 1) rendered not "seem," as in the Authorized Version, but "think": "lest any of you imagine he hath failed of it by coming too late in the day."¹ The exhortation to fear however does not suit such a state of mind. It is more likely that the writer was led to argue the point, that the promised rest was still left over, simply because there were Old Testament materials available for the purpose. He chose to present the truth as mediated through Old Testament texts

¹ So a number of the older commentators, and most recently Rendall, who says the rendering "seem" conveys no meaning to his mind.

fitted to stimulate both hope and fear: hope of gaining the rest, fear of losing it.

In so far as the section, vers. 1-10, has a didactic drift, its object is to confirm the hope; in so far as it is hortatory, its leading purpose is to enforce the warning, "let us fear."

The parenetic interest predominates at the commencement, vers. 1, 2, which may be thus paraphrased: "Now with reference to this rest I have been speaking of (iii. 18, 19), let us fear lest we miss it. For it is in our power to gain it, seeing the promise still remains over unfulfilled or but partially fulfilled. Let us fear, I say; for if we have a share in the promise, we have also in the threat of forfeiture: it too stands over. We certainly have a share in the promise; we have been evangelized, not merely in general, but with the specific gospel of rest. But those who first heard this gospel of rest failed through unbelief. So may we: therefore let us fear." When we thus view the connexion of thought in these two verses, we have no difficulty in understanding the omission of the pronoun (*ἡμεῖς*) in the first clause of ver. 2, which might surprise one. As in the previous chapter (ver. 6) the writer had said, "whose house are *we*," so we expect him here to say "*we* not less than they have received the good tidings of rest." But his point at this stage is not that *we* have been evangelized—that is, that the ancient gospel of rest concerns us as well as our forefathers,—but that we have been *evangelized*, and therefore are concerned in the threatening as well as in the promise.

To be noted is the freedom with which, as in the case of the word "apostle" (iii. 1), the writer uses the term *εὐηγγελισμένοι*, which might have been supposed to have borne in his time a stereotyped meaning. Any promise of God, any announcement of good tidings, is for him a gospel. Doubtless all God's promises are associated in his mind with the great final salvation, nevertheless they are formally distinct

from the historical Christian gospel. The gospel he has in view is not that which "began to be spoken by the Lord," but that spoken by the psalmist when he said, "To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts." Only when this is lost sight of can it create surprise that the statement in the text runs, "We have had a gospel preached unto us as well as they," instead of, "They had a gospel preached unto them as well as we."

Not less noteworthy is the way in which the abortive result of the preaching of the gospel of rest to the fathers is accounted for. "The word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." The remarkable point is the idea of *mixing*, instead of which one might have expected the introduction of some simple commonplace word such as "received": "The word did not profit, not being received in faith." Had this form of language been employed, we should probably have been spared the trouble of deciding between various readings. The penalty of originality in speaker or writer is misconception by reporters, copyists, and printers. Uncertain how the idea of mixing was to be taken the copyists would try their hand at conjectural emendation, changing *συγκεκρασμένος* into *συγκεκερασμένους*, or *vice versâ*. In this way corruption may have crept in very early, and it is quite possible that none of the extant readings is the true one.¹ Of the two most important variants given above, the second, according to which the participle has the accusative plural ending, and is in agreement with *ἐκείνους*, is the best attested, but it does not give the most probable sense: "The word did not profit them, because they were not mixed by faith with the (true) hearers." On this reading

¹ Bleek conjectures that instead of *ἀκούσαι* may have stood originally *ἀκούσ-μασι*. Among the various readings are several varieties of spelling and form in the participle *συγκεκερασμένος*, of no importance to the sense, but showing an unusual amount of uncertainty as to the original text.

the word "mixed" receives the intelligible sense of "associated with," but it is open to the serious objection that the writer has assumed in the previous chapter that there were no true hearers, or so few that they might be left out of account (iii. 16). Assuming that the other reading is to be preferred, according to which the participle is in agreement with λόγος, it is difficult to decide how the mixing is to be conceived of. Is the word mixed with faith in the hearer, or by faith with the hearer? and what natural analogy is suggested in either case? Obviously this reading points to a more intimate and vital union than that of association suggested by the other; such a union as takes place when food is assimilated by digestion and made part of the bodily organization. But how the matter presented itself to the writer's mind we can only conjecture. The one thing certain is, that he deemed faith indispensable to profitable hearing: a truth, happily, taught with equal clearness in the text, whatever reading we adopt.

At ver. 3 the didactic interest comes to the front. The new thought grafted into ver. 1 by the parenthetical clause, "a promise being still left," now becomes the leading affirmation. The assertion of ver. 2, "we have been evangelized," is repeated, with the emphasis this time on the "we"; for though the pronoun is not used, οἱ πιστεύσαντες stands in its stead. "We do enter into rest, *we believers in Christ.*" More is meant than that the rest belongs only to such as believe. It is a statement of historical fact, similar to "whose house are we"—Christians. Only there is this difference between the two affirmations, that whereas in the earlier it is claimed for Christians that they are God's house principally, if not exclusively, here the more modest claim is advanced in their behalf that they share in, are not excluded from, the rest. The writer indeed believes that the promise in its high ideal sense concerns Christians chiefly, if not alone; that thought is the tacit assumption

underlying his argument. But the position formally maintained is not, We Christians have a monopoly of the rest, but, We have a share in it, it belongs to us also. A rest is left over for the New Testament people of God.

The sequel as far as ver. 10 contains the proof of this thesis. The salient points are these two: *First*, God spoke of a rest to Israel by Moses, though He Himself rested from His works when the creation of the world was finished; therefore the *creation-rest* does not exhaust the idea and promise of rest. *Second*, the rest of Israel in Canaan under Joshua did not realize the Divine idea of rest, any more than did the personal rest of God at the creation, for we find the rest spoken of again in the Psalter as still remaining to be entered upon, which implies that the *Canaan-rest* was an inadequate fulfilment: "For if Joshua had given them rest"—*i.e.* given rest adequately, perfectly—"then would He (God or the Holy Spirit) not afterward have spoken of another day." The former of these two points contains the substance of what is said in vers. 3-5, the latter gives the gist of vers. 7, 8; whereupon follows the inference in ver. 9, a rest is left over. A third step in the argument by which the inference is justified is passed over in silence. It is, that neither in the psalmist's day nor at any subsequent period in Israel's history had the promise of rest been adequately fulfilled, any more than at the creation or in the days of Joshua. Had the writer chosen he might have shown this in detail, pointing out that even Solomon's reign did not bring complete rest; the Solomonic rest containing within its bosom the seeds of future disturbance, division, and warfare, and proving to be but a halcyon period, followed by wintry storms, bringing desolation and ruin on a once happy land. As for the rest after the return from Babylon, the only other point in Jewish history at which the promise could find a place whereon to set its foot, he would have no difficulty in showing what

a poor, imperfect, disappointing fulfilment it brought. Who that reads the sad, chequered tale of Ezra and Nehemiah would say that it realizes all the meaning of the twice-spoken oracle of Jeremiah: "Therefore fear thou not, O My servant Jacob; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest, and none shall make him afraid."¹

Our author takes the oracle in the Psalter as the final word of the Old Testament on the subject of rest, and therefore as a word which concerns the New Testament people of God. God spake of rest through David, implying that up till that time the long promised rest had not come, at least, in satisfying measure. Therefore a rest remains for Christians. Is the inference cogent? Because a certain promised good had not come up to a certain date, must it come now? Let us review the situation. The ancient Scriptures speak of a Divine rest which God enjoyed at the beginning of the world's history, and in which man seemed destined to share. But man's portion in this rest has never yet come in any satisfying degree. It came not at the creation, for after that came all too soon the fall; it came not at the entrance into Canaan, for the people of Israel had to take possession sword in hand, and long after their settlement they continued exposed to annoyance from the Canaanitish tribes; it came not from Joshua till David, for even in his late time the Holy Spirit still spoke of another day. Extending our view, we observe that it came not under Solomon, for after him came Rehoboam and the revolt of the ten tribes; it came not with the return of the tribes from Babylon, for envious neighbours kept them in a continual state of anxiety and fear, and they rebuilt their temple and the city walls in troublous times.

¹ Jer. xxx. 10, xlv. 27. The idea of rest is in these texts, but it is not rendered by *καταπαύω* in the Septuagint.

Is not the natural inference from all this that the rest will never come, all actual rests being but imperfect approximations to the ideal? So reasons unbelief, which treats the *summum bonum* in every form as a mere ideal, a beautiful dream, a pleasure of hope, like that of the maniac, to whom

“Mercy gave, to charm the sense of woe,
Ideal bliss that truth could never know.”

Far otherwise thought the writer of our epistle. He believed that all Divine promises, that the promise of rest in particular, shall be fulfilled with ideal completeness. “Some must enter in”; and as none have yet entered in perfectly, this bliss must be reserved for those on whom the ends of the world are come, even those who believe in Jesus. “There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God.”

A *sabbatism* our author calls the rest, so at the conclusion of his argument introducing a new name for it, after using another all through. It is one of the significant thought-suggesting words which abound in the epistle. It is not, we may be sure, employed merely for literary reasons, as if to vary the phraseology and avoid too frequent repetition of the word *κατάπαυσις*. Neither is it enough to say that the term was suggested by the fact that God rested on the seventh day. It embodies an idea. It felicitously connects the end of the world with the beginning, the consummation of all things with the primal state of the creation. It denotes the *ideal* rest, and so teaches by implication that Christians, not only have an interest in the gospel of rest, but for the first time enter into a rest which is worthy of the name, a rest corresponding to and fully realizing the Divine idea. This final name for the rest thus supplements the defect of the preceding argument, which understates the case for Christians. It further hints, though only hints, the nature of the ideal rest. It teaches that it is not merely

a rest which God gives, but the rest which God Himself enjoys. It is God's own rest for God's own true people, an ideal rest for an ideal community, embracing all believers, all believing Israelites of all ages, and many more; for God's rest began long before there was an Israel, and the gospel in the early chapters of Genesis is a gospel for *man*, as the writer of our epistle well knows, though he does not plainly say it. Into this sabbatic rest cessation from work enters as an essential element; for it is written that God "rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made." That this is the thought which our author chiefly associates with the term *σαββατισμός* appears from ver. 10, which may be thus paraphrased: "One who enters into rest ceases, like God, from work, and therefore may be said to enjoy a sabbatism." But this yields only a negative idea of the rest, and the *summum bonum* can hardly be a pure negation. The rabbinical conception of the Sabbath was purely negative. The rabbis made a fetish of abstinence from whatever bore the semblance of work, however insignificant in amount, and whatever its nature and intention. Christ discarded this rabbinized Sabbath, and put in its place a humanized Sabbath, making man's good the law of observance, declaring that it was always lawful to do well, and justifying beneficent activity by representing Divine activity as incessant, and Divine rest therefore as only relative, a change in the manifested form of an eternal energy. We do not know how far our author was acquainted with the sabbatic controversies of the gospels, but we cannot doubt on which side his sympathies would be. It has been suggested that he coined a name for the rest that remains, containing an allusion to the seventh day rest, that he might wean the Hebrews from its external observance by pointing out its spiritual end.¹ This view rests on no positive evidence, but it is far more credible than that the

¹ So Calvin.

bliss of the future world meant for him the eternal prolongation of a rabbinical Sabbath, as it meant for the Talmudist who wrote: "The Israelites said, Lord of all the world, show us a type of the world to come. God answered them, That type is the Sabbath." He took his ideas of the perfect rest, not from the degenerate traditions of the rabbis, but from the book of Origins. That being the fountain of his inspiration, it is probable that he conceived of the ideal rest, not as cessation from work absolutely, but only from the weariness and pain which often accompany it. There was work for man in paradise. God placed him in the garden of Eden to work it¹ and to keep it; and the whole description of the curse implies that it is the sorrow of labour, and not labour itself, that is the unblessed element. The *ἔργα* which pass away when the ideal rest comes are the *κόποι*—the irksome toil and worry—of which John speaks in the book of Revelation: "They shall rest from their labours," and "pain shall be no more."²

We have seen that our author borrows three distinct conceptions of the great salvation from the primitive history of man. It is reasonable to suppose that they were all connected together in his mind, and formed one picture of the highest good. They suggest the idea of paradise restored: the Divine ideal of man and the world and their mutual relations realized in perpetuity; man made veritably lord of creation, delivered from the fear of death, nay, death itself for ever left behind, and no longer subject to servile tasks, but occupied only with work worthy of a king and a son of God, and compatible with perfect repose and undisturbed enjoyment. It is an apocalyptic vision: fruition lies in the beyond. The dominion and deathless-

¹ *ἐργάζεσθαι* in Septuagint.

² Rev. xiv. 13, xxi. 4. Very significant for the sense of *κόπος* are the texts Luke xi. 7, xviii. 5; Gal. vi. 17. Worry, annoyance, enter into its meaning in all three places.

ness and sabbatism are reserved for the world to come, objects of hope for those who believe.

The perfect rest will come, and a people of God will enter into it, of these things our author is well assured ; but he fears lest the Hebrew Christians should forfeit their share in the felicity of that people : therefore he ends his discourse on the gospel of rest as he began, with solemn admonition. "Let us fear lest we enter not in," he said at the beginning ; "let us give diligence to enter in," he says now at the close. Then to enforce the exhortation he appends two words of a practical character, one fitted to inspire awe, the other to cheer Christians of desponding temper.

The former of these passages (vers. 12, 13) describes the attributes of the Divine word, the general import of the statement being that the word of God, like God Himself, is not to be trifled with ; the word referred to being, in the first place, the word of threatening which doomed unbelieving, disobedient Israelites to perish in the wilderness, and, by implication, every word of God. The account given of the Divine word is impressive, almost appalling. It is endowed in succession with the qualities of the lightning, which moves with incredible swiftness like a living spirit, and hath force enough to shiver to atoms the forest trees ; of a two-edged sword, whose keen, glancing blade cuts clean through everything, flesh, bone, sinew ; of the sun in the firmament, from whose great piercing eye, as he circles round the globe, nothing on earth is hid. "Living is the word of God and energetic, and more cutting than every two-edged sword, penetrating even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and discerning and judging the affections and thoughts of the heart. And there is not a creature invisible before it, but all things are bare and exposed to the eyes of Him with whom we have to reckon."

The description falls into four parts. First, "living and forceful is the word." I have suggested a comparison to

the lightning as interpretative of the epithet "living." Possibly the allusion is to a seed, in which life and force lie dormant together, capable of development under fitting conditions. The blade of grain is the witness both of the life and of the power latent in the seed from which it springs. Or perhaps the thought intended is that the word of threatening, though spoken long ago, is not dead, but living still, instinct with the eternal life and energy of God who spake it, a word for to-day, as well as for bygone ages.

There is no difficulty in determining to what the Divine word is likened in the next member of the sentence, for it is expressly compared to a sword. The only difficulty lies in the construction and interpretation of the words descriptive of its achievements in this capacity. Does the word divide soul from spirit, or both soul and spirit, not only soul, but even spirit? And what are we to make of the mention of joints and marrow, after soul and spirit? Have we here a mingling of metaphor and literal truth, and an accumulation of phrase in order to heighten the impression? or is it meant that "joints and marrow" are the subject of a distinct action of the word? Believing that we have to do here with rhetoric and poetry, rather than with dogmatic theology, I prefer a free, broad interpretation of the words to that which finds in them a contribution to biblical psychology and a support for the doctrine of the trichotomy of human nature, which, with all respect for its patrons, savours in my opinion of pedantry. The simple meaning of the passage is this: The word of God divides the soul, yea, the very spirit of man, even to its joints and marrow. It is a strong, poetical way of saying that the word penetrates into the inmost recesses of our spiritual being, to the thoughts, emotions, and hidden motives, whence outward actions flow, as easily and as surely as a sword of steel cuts through the joints and marrows of the physical frame. Thus understood, the second part of the description

leads naturally up to the third, which speaks of the critical function of the word, in virtue of which it is "the candle of the Lord searching all the inward parts."

In the concluding part of the eloquent panegyric on the word, it is spoken of in a way which suggests the idea, not of a candle, but of the sun, which beholdeth all things; and in the final clause, it is said of God Himself, that all things are naked and exposed to His eyes. The word which I have rendered *exposed* is one of uncertain meaning, and untranslatable except by periphrasis. When a Greek writer used it he had a picture in his mind which charged it with a significance and force no English word can reproduce; but what the picture was it is not easy to determine. The most probable opinion is that *τραχηλίζω*, not found in classical Greek authors, was a coinage of the wrestling school, to express the act of a wrestler who overmastered his antagonist by seizing him by the neck. Hence the participle *τετραχληλισμένος* might come to mean one overpowered, as by calamity, or by passion. The verb and its compound *ἐκτραχηλίζω* occur frequently in Philo, in this tropical sense. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the meaning must be more specific, involving a reference to the effect of the grip of the wrestler on the head of his antagonist, which might be either to force it downwards, or to throw it backwards, according as he was seized behind or before. In the one case, we should render "downcast,"¹ in the other, "exposed"; the one epithet suggesting the desire of the guilty one to hide his face from the searching eye of God, the other implying that no one, however desirous, can so hide himself from the Divine gaze.²

¹ So Rendall, whose note on the passage is well worth consulting.

² The reference to Philo reminds me that another word in this eulogy on the word of God recalls him to the thoughts of one familiar with his writings. I refer to the epithet *τομώτερος*, which sounds like an echo of Philo's doctrine concerning the cutting or dividing function of the Logos in the universe, set forth at length in the book *Quis div. rer. heres*. Indeed one bent on establishing a

In the closing sentences of the chapter the writer winds up the long exhortation to steadfastness by an inspiring allusion to the sympathy of the great High Priest, who has passed out of this time-world, through the veil of the visible heavens, into the celestial world; taking care that his last word shall be of a cheering character, and also so managing that the conclusion of this hortatory section shall form a suitable introduction to the next part of his discourse. On this account vers. 14-16 might have been reserved for consideration in a future paper, but I prefer to notice them here, following the traditional division of the chapters. How truly they form a part of the exhortation which began at chap. iii. 1 appears from the repetition of phrases. "Consider the High Priest of our confession," the writer had said there; "having a High Priest, let us hold fast our confession," he says here. But it is to be noted that he does not simply repeat himself. The movement of his thought is like that of the flowing tide, which falls back upon itself, yet in each successive wave advances to a point beyond that reached by any previous one. Here for the third time Christ is desig-

close connexion between our author and Philo might find a copious supply of plausible material in this part of the epistle. Besides these two words, there are the epithet "great high priest," and the attribute of sinlessness, applied here to Christ, and to the Logos by Philo, and in the next chapter the unusual word *μετριοπαθεῖν*, also occurring in Philo. Then does not the expression *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* seem like an allusion to the mystic personified Logos of whom one reads everywhere in Philo? and is not this fervent eulogy on the word almost like an extract from the praises of the Logos unweariedly sung by the philosophic Jew of Alexandria? The resemblance in style is certainly striking, yet I concur in the judgment of Principal Drummond, that "there is nothing to prove conscious borrowing, and it is probable that the resemblances are due to the general condition of religious culture among the Jews" (*Philo Judæus*, vol. i., "Introduction," p. 12). In any case, whatever is to be said of the style, it is certain that our epistle is independent of Philo in thought and spirit. The word of God here is not Philo's Logos, nor is his cutting function the same. Philo calls the Logos the "cutter" (*ὁ τομεύς*), as cutting chaos into distinct things, and so creating a kosmos. The cutting function of the word in our epistle is wholly ethical. The originality of the epistle in thought is all the more remarkable if the writer was acquainted with Philo's writings, so that there is no cause for jealous denial of such acquaintance. It is a mere question of fact.

nated a High Priest, and attributes are ascribed to Him as such which are to form the theme of the next great division of the epistle, wherein the priestly office of Christ is elaborately discussed. The writer re-invites the attention of his readers to the High Priest of their confession, and in doing so uses words every one of which contains an assertion which he means to prove or illustrate, and which being proved will serve the great end of the whole epistle, the instruction and confirmation of the ignorant and tempted.

The first important word is the epithet "great" prefixed to the title High Priest. It is introduced to make the priestly office of Christ assume due importance in the minds of the Hebrews. It serves the same purpose as if the title High Priest had been written in large capitals, and asserts by implication, not merely the *reality* of Christ's priestly office, but the superiority of Christ as the High Priest of humanity over all the high priests of Israel, Aaron not excepted. As an author writing a treatise on an important theme, writes the title of the theme in letters fitted to attract notice, so the writer of our epistle places at the head of the ensuing portion this title, JESUS THE SON OF GOD THE GREAT HIGH PRIEST, insinuating thereby that He of whom he speaks is the greatest of all priests, the only real priest, the very Ideal of priesthood realized.

The expression "passed through the heavens" is also very suggestive. It hints at the right construction to be put upon Christ's departure from the earth. There is an obvious allusion to the entering of the high priest of Israel within the veil on the great day of atonement; and the idea suggested is, that the ascension of Christ was the passing of the great High Priest through the veil into the celestial sanctuary, as our representative and in our interest.

The name given to the great High Priest, "Jesus the Son of God," contributes to the argument. Jesus is the

historical person, the tempted Man ; and this part of the name lays the foundation for what is to be said in the following sentence concerning His power to sympathise. The title "Son of God," on the other hand, justifies what has been already said of the High Priest of our confession. If our High Priest be the Son of God, he may well be called the *Great*, and moreover there can be no doubt whither He has gone. Whither but to His native abode, His Father's house?

Having thus by brief, pregnant phrase hinted the thoughts he means to prove, our author proceeds to address to his readers an exhortation, which is repeated at the close of the long discussion on the priesthood of Christ to which these sentences are the prelude.¹ In doing so he gives prominence to that feature of Christ's priestly character of which alone he has as yet spoken explicitly: His power to sympathise, acquired and guaranteed by His experience of temptation.² He presents Christ to view as the Sympathetic One in golden words which may be regarded as an inscription on the breastplate of the High Priest of humanity: "We have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been tempted in all points like ourselves, without sin."

It is noteworthy that the doctrine of Christ's sympathy is here stated in a defensive, apologetic manner, "We have not a High Priest who cannot be touched," as if there were some one maintaining the contrary. This defensive attitude may be conceived of as assumed over against two possible objections to the reality of Christ's sympathy, one drawn from His dignity as the Son of God, the other from His sinlessness. Both objections are dealt with in the only way open to one who addresses weak faith; *viz.* not by elaborate or philosophical argument, but by strong assertion.

¹ Chap. x. 19-23.

² Chap. ii. 17, 18.

As the psalmist said to the desponding, "Wait, I say, on the Lord," and as Jesus said to disciples doubting the utility of prayer, "I say unto you, Ask, and ye shall receive," so our author says to dispirited Christians, "We have *not* a High Priest who *cannot* be touched with sympathy"—this part of his assertion disposing of doubt engendered by Christ's dignity—"but one who has been tempted in all respects as we are, apart from sin"—this part of the assertion meeting doubt based on Christ's sinlessness. How this can be is a question theologians may discuss, but which our author passes over in silence.¹

To this strong assertion of Christ's power to sympathise is fitly appended the final exhortation: "Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and grace for seasonable succour." Specially noteworthy are the words *προσερχόμεθα μετὰ παρησίας*, *Let us approach confidently*. They have more than practical import: they are of theoretic significance; they strike the doctrinal keynote of the epistle: Christianity the religion of free access. In the opening paper I said that this great thought first finds distinct, clear utterance in chap. vi. 20, where Christ is called our *forerunner*. But it is hinted, though not so plainly, here, it being implied that the priesthood of Christ, in virtue of His sympathy, and of other properties remaining to be mentioned, for the first time makes free, fearless, close approach to God possible. There is a latent contrast between Christianity and Leviticalism, as in a corresponding passage in Paul's epistles there is an expressed contrast between Christianity and Mosaism. "Having therefore," writes the apostle, "such a hope, we use great boldness (of speech, *παρησία*), and are not as Moses, who put a veil upon his face";² the contrast

¹ The sinlessness of Christ here asserted means, in the first place, that He never yielded to temptation, but that implies as its source absolute sinlessness.

² 2 Cor. iii. 12, 13.

being between the free, frank, unreserved speech of the minister of a religion of life, righteousness, and good hope, and the mystery observed by the minister of a religion of condemnation, death, and despair. The one cannot be too plain spoken, because he has good news to tell; the other has to practise reserve, to keep up respect for a rude, imperfect *cultus* which cannot afford to have the whole truth told. Paul's contrast relates to a diversity in the attitude assumed by the ministers of the two religions towards *men*. That latent in the text before us, on the other hand, relates to diversity of attitude towards *God*: the Christian has courage to draw near to God, while the votary of the old religion lacks courage. But the reason of the contrast is the same in both cases; *viz.* because Christianity is the religion of good hope. "Having such hope (as is inspired by the nature of Christianity), we are outspoken," says Paul; "having the better hope based on the priesthood of Christ, we draw nigh to God confidently," says the author of our epistle.

The contrast is none the less real that the expression "to draw near" was applied to acts of worship under the Levitical system. Every act of worship in any religion whatever may be called an approach to Deity. Nevertheless religions may be wide apart as the poles in respect to the measure in which they draw near to God. In one religion the approach may be ceremonial only, while the spirit stands afar off in fear. In another, the approach may be spiritual, with mind and heart, in intelligence, trust, and love, and with the confidence which these inspire. Such an approach alone is real, and deserves to be called a drawing near to God. Such an approach was first made possible by Christ, and on this account it is that the religion which bears His name is the perfect, final, perennial religion.

A. B. BRUCE.

TWO PARABLES.

THE PRODIGAL SON (LUKE XV. 11-32).

THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD (MATT. XIX. 27; XX. 16).

THERE is very little resemblance between the external form and imagery of these two parables, except that both are taken from the relations of men in common life; and they were spoken on very different occasions. The earlier of the two, that of the Prodigal, was mainly addressed to the Pharisees, in reply to their complaint against Jesus that "this Man receiveth sinners and eateth with them"; though it was spoken to a mixed audience, consisting both of Pharisees and of those whom they denounced as sinners. The later of the two parables, that of the Labourers in the Vineyard, was spoken to the disciples alone, in answer to Peter's question, when, referring to the young ruler who had refused to give up all for Christ, he said, on behalf of the rest of the Twelve as well as himself, "Lo, we have forsaken all and followed Thee; what shall we have therefore?"

There is also this contrast, that while the parable of the Prodigal has probably impressed men more than anything else in Christ's teaching, and in its most impressive point seems, and is, perfectly clear, the parable of the Labourers has impressed mankind comparatively little, and is regarded by most readers as a perplexing parable. Nevertheless, we think it can be shown that the teaching of the two is closely similar.

The lesson of both is double. In the latter there are the cases of the first hired and the last hired labourers, in the former those of the two sons; and in each parable there is equal emphasis laid on the two cases. It is indeed perhaps to be regretted that the former is universally called the parable of the Prodigal; because the lesson which

Christ means to teach through the elder brother is as important as that taught through the younger, though much less obvious. It would be better to call this the parable of the Two Sons, were not this title already appropriated to another and later parable, also spoken to the Pharisees and rulers (Matt. xxi. 28, 32).

The three parables in Luke xv., the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Money, and the Lost Son, were evidently spoken about the same time, and form a series. But the words, "and He said," at the commencement of the third, indicate a transition of some kind; and it may be that our Lord, at this point of His discourse, meant, and was understood by His audience to mean, "I have till now been addressing the Pharisees in defence of My action in receiving sinners and eating with them. I have yet more to say on the subject; and to this I ask the attention of the publicans and sinners also. I have been speaking of the action of God and His Son in seeking and saving the lost; I have now to speak, not only to those who think they are righteous, but at the same time to those who know they are lost."

This lesson, that God will receive repentant sinners, and that man ought to receive them, is the most prominent lesson of the parable, and for most readers it appears to be the only one. Most readers probably think that the conversation where the Father justifies Himself to His elder son for receiving the returned prodigal with rejoicing, is only meant to heighten the effect of the whole. To which view we think it may be replied, that, on a first reading at least, it does *not* heighten the effect; and we suspect that those who think thus would, if they were to speak their real minds, like the parable better if it had ended with the reception of the prodigal by his Father. But if we understand the elder son to be a mere Pharisee, and, as our Lord tells us the Pharisees generally were,

a hypocrite, we shall lose half the worth of the parable. Such a view of his character is refuted by the clear statements of the parable itself. He said to his Father, "Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of Thine"; and so far was his Father from contradicting this, or treating it as mere pharisaic self-righteousness, that he replied, "Son, thou art ever with Me, and all that is Mine is thine." Compare with this St. Paul's assertion of the blessedness of God's children: "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. viii. 17). "Whether the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours" (1 Cor. iii. 22). If Stier is right, that this reply of the Father is only ironical, God's most gracious promise may be without meaning;

"And if this fail,
The pillared firmament is rottenness."

Who then are they that are represented by the elder son? and what is the teaching of that part of the parable? We reply, that the elder son, who had served his Father all his life, is nearly identical with the labourers that had toiled in the vineyard from early morning; and the murmuring of the elder brother at seeing the prodigal received with festivity, and restored, without a word of reproach, to a son's place in the Father's house and the Father's love, is parallel to the murmuring of the labourers who had borne the burden of the day and the scorching heat, when they saw those who had worked but one hour, and that in the evening, paid as much as themselves. And the answer to both is the same. God's service differs from man's in this, that mere length of service does not count in the apportioning of reward. When the repentance of the returning prodigal is sincere, he is restored at once to the place which his sins had forfeited; and when the

service of the late engaged labourer is honest, he receives an equal reward with those who have toiled all day. "God giveth (and forgiveth) liberally, and upbraideth not" (Jas. i. 5).¹ We are accepted, not according to what we have done, but according to what we are.

Though the imagery of these two parables is taken from the relations of ordinary human life, yet the lesson is drawn by representing men as acting as they do *not* act in ordinary life. It never was the custom of any country to pay a day's wages for an hour's work; nor to let a young man take his inheritance before his father's death, and then go away and waste it. And though the Father's action in welcoming the returned prodigal does not seem so strange to us who have been taught by Christ, it probably appeared strange, and almost monstrous, to the Pharisees who heard it.

Among careless readers, the impression left by the parable of the Labourers is, that it is possible to enter the service of God at any time of life, and at the end receive an equal reward with those who have served Him all their lives. This view however is contradicted by the parable itself. To the question, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" the answer was, "Because no man hath hired us." But if any of the labourers had, in the middle of the day, or even early in the morning, refused the offer of work in mere idleness and in reliance on the kindness of the owner of the vineyard, we cannot think he would have permitted them to come in at the eleventh hour at all; or if he had, he would not have paid them a day's wages for an hour's work. From the language and imagery of this parable alone, it would be much more reasonable to infer that God's call to work in His vineyard, if once disregarded, will never be renewed. But no parable is meant to provide

¹ The Epistle of James contains so many allusions to Christ's recorded teaching, that it is probable this may be one of His unrecorded sayings.

for all cases. The case of those who disregard God's call and their own privileges is not touched on in this parable, but that of the Prodigal reveals a degree of longsuffering of God with sinners which man could not have dared to hope for. And such an inference as that God's call, if disregarded once, is necessarily withdrawn for ever, would also be contrary to our Lord's express teaching in the parable of the Two Sons (Matt. xxi. 28), where a son who at first refused to work in his father's vineyard afterwards changed his mind, and was permitted to go to work.

The doctrine of the equality of all rewards also is doubly contradicted, both in the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard itself, and in the conversation that led to it. In answer to Peter's question, "What shall we have therefore?" (Matt. xix. 27) Christ replied, "Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration (or restoration of all things: cf. Acts iii. 21) when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." We cannot tell the exact meaning of these mysterious words, but they evidently point to some high and peculiar honour which in the future world will belong to those who in this world have been first in the service of Christ's kingdom; and if to the Twelve, then also to St. Paul and all others who have done the most in His service. The same truth is clearly hinted at in the parable of the Pounds (Luke xix. 12-27), where one servant of a nobleman who had been made a king is rewarded with the government of ten cities for the service of earning ten pounds for his master, and another servant with five cities for earning five pounds. But having promised this reward—the highest which the imagination of an Israelite could conceive—of being viceroys over Israel in the kingdom of the Messiah, the Lord changes His tone, and warns His disciples that the expectation of such glory has its own temptations, and

must not be too highly esteemed. In nearly the same spirit, He said on another occasion, "In this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you ; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Luke x. 20). And in a similar spirit, when speaking of the signs and wonders that were to be wrought in answer to the prayer of faith, He adds the caution, apparently without anything to suggest it except the necessity for it, "Whosoever ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any one ; that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses" (Mark xi. 25). In the passage before us He illustrates His meaning by the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, and both introduces and sums up His parable with the warning, "Many shall be last that are first, and first that are last" (Matt. xix. 30, xx. 16) : showing that the highest rewards—including in the reward the Master's approval—do not necessarily belong either to the longest service or to the greatest quantity of work, or even to the most steadfast endurance of the "scorching heat" of persecution ; and in the parable itself He implies that the highest place in His kingdom can only be given to those who show an unselfish, ungrudging, and unmurmuring spirit. The same words—"the last shall be first and the first last"—might have occurred at the end of the parable of the Prodigal ; the elder son was first, but with his unloving, pharisaic spirit he was in danger of becoming last. It is the same teaching as that of St. Paul, in a passage which is perhaps seldom thought of in connexion with this parable: "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned (a harder thing than to toil under the scorching noonday heat of a Syrian summer) and have not the charity which envieth not, seeketh not its own, is not easily provoked, and thinketh no evil, it profiteth me nothing" (1 Cor. xiii.).

It is now time to consider the question, how we are meant by our Lord to understand the position of the elder brother of the Prodigal, and of the earliest hired labourers; and it is our opinion that whatever difficulties belong to these questions are produced by the attempt to read meanings into these parables which do not properly belong to our Lord's words, and are inconsistent with them.

First, as to the elder son. There is, at first sight, a real difficulty in the case. He is introduced solely for the purpose of rebuke and warning; and yet his Father's saying, "Son, thou art ever with Me, and all that is Mine is thine," briefly and simply describes a state of privilege and blessing equal to the highest which man or angel can ever hope to attain. How is this apparent inconsistency to be reconciled? Very simply, as it seems to us. Our Lord was addressing the Pharisees in reply to their objection to His receiving sinners. He might have replied by denouncing their own sins; but on this occasion He preferred, for the sake of argument and illustration, to take them at their best, and to describe a man who had attained to their own ideal; one who, like St. Paul before his conversion, was "as touching the righteousness which is in the law found blameless" (Phil. iii. 6). This, it is true, was not and could not be the Christian ideal, for "the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John i. 17); but it was the ideal of righteousness held up before ancient Israel;—and He so framed the parable as to show them the special errors and temptations of such a character: ignorance of the gracious purposes of God towards sinners, and ignorance of the root of sin contained in that desire for some degree of independence of the Father which prompted the complaint, "Thou never gavest me (even) a kid that I might make merry with my friends." In modern language, we may imagine the Father answering: "You are most unreasonable. You serve Me these many years!

No doubt ; you are My heir, and in serving Me you best serve yourself. You never transgressed a commandment of Mine ! No doubt ; and are My commandments grievous ? I never gave you a kid wherein to feast with your friends ! You have always been at liberty to invite them to My table ; and if they do not like to dine with Me, they are no fit company for My son." Such a reply would have been deserved ; but the Father made the gentle and gracious answer, " Son, thou art ever with Me, and all that is Mine is thine " ; which, if the son had ears to hear, was a keener rebuke. In his desire to feast sometimes with his own friends, apart from his Father, was contained the germ of that love of independence which, in its full development, brought his brother to riotous and wasteful living (probably, though not certainly, with harlots), and afterwards to the service of the stranger and the herding of swine. This root of sin is in us all ; but in him it was not so full grown as to bring forth death (Jas. i. 15). The purpose and meaning of this conversation between the Father and the elder son is to show what are the special dangers and temptation of those who, like that son, live all their lives in the habitual observance of the commandments of God ; and, further, to show the safeguard against these dangers : namely, to appreciate as they deserve the privileges and blessings of such a life. The Father's answer, " Son, thou art ever with Me, and all that is Mine is thine," was no new revelation ; it might have been introduced with " remember " : and had he rightly remembered it, he would not have wished to feast with his own friends apart from his Father, and would have loved the Prodigal for the Father's sake, if not for his own.

But neither here, nor in the very similar conversation between the Owner of the vineyard and the first hired labourers, is there the slightest hint at final or eternal condemnation ; except only the hint addressed to the

Pharisees in the words, "And the elder son was angry, and would not go in," intimating that if they persisted in their rejection of Christ's teaching, they would be self-excluded from the marriage supper of the Lamb. I do not mean to deny that there have been, and may be still, many who regard themselves as careful observers of all Christ's commandments, and yet are the spiritual children of those who slew the prophets and crucified the Christ. And it is also true, and it is the chief lesson of the parable of the Ten Virgins, spoken by our Lord not long after to the disciples alone (Matt. xxv. 1), that profession of Christianity before the world, symbolized by the lamps, and legal purity of life, symbolized by virginity, will not avail to save without the true spirit of religion in the heart;—without which what was meant to be the light, not only of the Church, but of the world, may "burn dim like a lamp with oil unfed," and what was meant to be the salt of the earth may lose its savour (Matt. v. 13, 14). But no one parable, and no one discourse, can teach all truth; and our Lord in the two parables now before us is not speaking of such cases. The words, "many are called but few chosen," are now admitted to be spurious, where the old text has them at the end of the parable of the Labourers; and it is not in the least like the teaching of Christ to hold that those who habitually keep all God's commandments, like the elder son, or spend a long life in the honest and unbroken service of God, like the earliest hired labourers, are in danger of losing their eternal reward for a fit of anger or sullenness, caused by misunderstanding a manifestation of Divine grace *which they had not been taught to understand*; for they had received their training under not the Gospel but the Law. Such dissatisfaction was, no doubt, of the nature of sin even in them, and in men trained by Christ's teaching it would be decidedly sinful; but "there is a sin not unto death" (1 John v. 17). The penny—the day's wages in the latter

parable—is eternal life, the reward of a lifetime spent in the service of God; and the saying of the Householder to the murmuring labourer, “Take up that which is thine, and go thy way,” has nothing to do with “Depart, ye cursed,”¹ but only means, “Cease this useless disputing, and go home to supper with thy well earned wages.” There was no harshness in bidding him go away when he could gain nothing by remaining, for the imagery of this parable does not include any invitation to a dinner or supper. It is true that Judas, who, being one of the twelve, was among the first, fell away altogether; but there is no allusion in this parable to such a case. The crime by which Judas fell was not a deficiency in the charity taught by Christ, but a treason which would have been judged worthy of death by a merely human and worldly tribunal. In giving the warning, “Many that are first shall be last, and the last first,” Christ had not in His thought anything like, “Have not I chosen you Twelve, and one of you is a devil?” (John vi. 70.) He rather meant the same as when, on an earlier occasion, the disciples, in the same spirit as Peter when he inquired, “What shall we have therefore?” asked who—meaning which of the Twelve—was to be greatest in the kingdom of heaven; and He replied, “Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. xviii. 1, 4). And when the two sons of Zebedee asked for the chief place in the kingdom of Christ, He told the disciples, “Whosoever would be first among you shall be (that is to say, *let him be*) your servant” (Matt. xx. 20, 28).

To sum up our conclusions. In each of the two parables before us there are two distinct lessons: one of them

¹ The saying which Stier quotes with approval from Luther, “They take their penny and are damned,” seems to us perversely wrong.

primary, simple, and obvious; the other secondary, and more recondite and hidden.

In the parable of the Prodigal, the primary lesson is that God is willing to welcome repentant prodigals, and that men ought to welcome them;—that God forgives freely and without upbraiding, so that when repentance is sincere restoration is complete. In that of the Labourers, the primary lesson is the kindred one, that those who enter the service of God late in life shall notwithstanding, if their service is sincere, be placed on an equality, in the final distribution of rewards, with those who have served God all their lives;—that mere length of service does not count at all in the apportioning of heavenly rewards.

The secondary lesson of the parable of the Prodigal is a warning against the special dangers of a life spent, from its beginning, in the habitual service of God;—the danger of trusting in one's own righteousness rather than in the grace of God, and of permitting the beginning of an alienation of the heart from God to go on, unchecked because unnoticed. And the secondary lesson of the parable of the Labourers is the kindred one, that those who have served God all their lives, or in any eminent way, are in danger of trusting in their own services rather than in the grace of God, and regarding with jealousy those who are placed on an equality with them after a shorter period of service, or after services which from a human point of view appear but small. These two errors are the same in kind, and the proper counter-active of both is the same; namely, a truer appreciation of the privileges and blessings which are theirs as God's children, by His grace:—not on condition of works, but of faith. The elder son is told by his Father, "Thou art ever with Me, and all that is Mine is thine"; the first hired labourers go home to their eternal rest with the well-earned wages of a lifetime of toil and endurance in the Master's service. No further blessing is needed, or possible, except a right

appreciation of that which they already enjoy, and more love and confidence towards their heavenly Father and Master. Although in the heavenly kingdom the principle of reward is recognised, and eminent services shall be eminently honoured, yet even in the apportionment of reward there is no place for boasting: we "are not under law, but under grace" (Rom. vi. 14); and the Lord looks chiefly, not to the service done, but to the spirit in which it is done. If they learn rightly to understand this, their trust and love towards their Master and Father will make it impossible to have any feeling of jealousy towards those whom He has set on an equality with them. But if such feelings, natural as they are, are not overcome, those who are the first in length or amount of service may be the last in their Lord's favour;—not excluded from the kingdom, but last and least in it.

But are patient toil and endurance in the Master's service to have no reward of their own? are they to be, in the eternal kingdom, as though they had never been? It cannot be so. There will be no comparing and balancing of claims;—

"Heaven rejects the lore
Of nicely calculated less or more";¹

but God will turn all to good in His own way, which is not ours.

In conclusion, we must consider some objections which may be made to the ideas here expressed as to the nature of the character indicated by the elder brother and the first hired labourers. Their view of things is certainly natural; so natural that, notwithstanding our Lord's teaching in these two parables, it is still a common, and perhaps we may even say the preponderant, view among His followers;

¹ Wordsworth's Sonnet on King's College Chapel, Cambridge.

and it will perhaps be said by some of our readers that we are arguing in its favour.

We certainly do not mean to take the part of the elder brother against the prodigal, and of the first hired labourers against the last. This would be to take their part against the Teacher who spoke these parables in order to refute their errors. But we think that readers of the gospels—perhaps even some who themselves fall into the same errors when occasion arises—are generally too hard on them. It seems to us a total misunderstanding of Christ's words to say that the elder son and the first hired labourers are for their murmuring excluded from the kingdom, and have their portion among the unfaithful and the hypocrites. This is contradicted in the case of the elder son by the words of his conversation with the Father; and in the case of the first hired labourers by the fact that the parable was spoken to the Twelve, immediately after the promise of the highest honour in the Messiah's kingdom which an Israelite could imagine. The purpose of these parables is not to threaten condemnation, but to warn the hearers against the errors to which those are specially liable who spend their lives in the service of God. But so far from agreeing with the notion that the elder son, who has never transgressed his Father's commandments, is rather worse than a prodigal; or that the labourers "take their penny and are damned" for their displeasure with an action on their Master's part which would displease any man who had never heard of the like, it is our belief that the faults of temper displayed by them, and by very many disciples of Christ since then, are not by any means faults of wickedness, but are chiefly due to deficiency of imagination. These persons are typical men of the old moral world. Christ has introduced new and higher principles of thought and action, but the Gospel must be based on the Law. Such men are certainly not typical Christians, but neither are the labourers who were

hired at the eleventh hour, and still less the returned prodigal;—the typical Christian is the elder brother when he is reconciled to the returned prodigal, and the labourer who, after bearing the burden of the day and the scorching heat, learns graciously to acquiesce in his Master's action in placing on an equality with him the labourer who entered at the eleventh hour.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

PROFESSOR HUXLEY AND THE SWINE OF GADARA.

PROFESSOR HUXLEY's article on Agnosticism in the February number of the *Nineteenth Century* is one of uncommon interest. The bits of mental autobiography with which he favours us are both instructive and captivating. He champions moreover the position of a much-read novel, and assumes that belief in Christianity is entirely a question of the worth of a group of historical records that have hitherto been supposed to reflect its origins. He also restates some of the old difficulties arising out of the triple narrative of the Gadarene demoniac, and ventures to stake the credibility or otherwise of the gospel traditions upon the truth or falseness of the psychology that underlies the narrative. In conclusion, he tells us that "the choice then lies between discrediting those who compiled the gospel biographies and disbelieving the Master whom they thought to honour by preserving such traditions of the exercise of His authority over Satan's invisible world."

Without word-wasting preamble the professor throws down the gage before the theologians in the following clear and candid terms:

"I find in the second gospel a statement, to all appearance intended to have the same evidential value as any other contained in that history. It is the well-known story of the devils who were cast out of a man, and ordered or permitted to enter into a herd of swine, to the great loss or damage of the innocent Gerasene or Gadarene pig owners. There can be no doubt that the narrator intends to convey to his readers his own conviction that this casting out and entering in were effected by the agency of Jesus of Nazareth, that by speech and action Jesus enforced this conviction; nor does any inkling of the legal and moral difficulties of the case manifest itself.

"On the other hand, everything that I know of physiological and pathological science leads me to entertain a very strong conviction that the phenomena ascribed to possession are as purely natural as those which constitute small-pox: everything that I know of anthropology leads me to think that the belief in demons and demoniacal possession is the mere survival of a once universal superstition, and that its persistence at the present time is pretty much in the inverse ratio of the general instruction, intelligence, and sound judgment of the population among whom it prevails. Everything that I know of law and justice convinces me that the wanton destruction of other people's property is a misdemeanour of evil example. Again, the study of history, and especially that of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, leaves no shadow of doubt on my mind that the belief in the reality of possession and witchcraft, justly based, alike by Catholics and Protestants, upon this and innumerable other passages in the Old and New Testaments, gave rise, through the special influence of Christian ecclesiastics, to the most horrible persecutions and judicial murders of thousands upon thousands of innocent men, women, and children."

It is an assumption at once audacious and ambiguous that the phenomena ascribed to possession are "as purely natural as those which constitute small-pox." Possibly the professor may leave the door ajar for his escape from all the issues of the statement by making the word "natural" embrace both the known and unknown laws and the seen and unseen factors in human mind and life. This critical scientist would perhaps scarcely venture to say that these phenomena admit of a purely *physical* explanation, as any such assertion might leave out of account some of the facts of recent psychological research. Once allow that the energy of evil may gather itself up into unseen personal centres,

and the narratives of demoniacal possession perhaps make a less violent demand upon our credulity than some of the strange things that have been sifted again and again by members of the Psychic Research Society and set forth in their reports. Not a little has been done to explain the mental conditions under which possession is conceivable, and the narratives read less like myths than they might have done fifty years ago.

The mental condition that made the spiritual maladies described in the New Testament possible was probably analogous to that induced upon his subject by the mesmerist. The will and the higher mental and spiritual faculties were put to sleep and paralysed, and the realm of the emotions and sensibilities came under the control of an alien will. To all intents and purposes a mesmerised subject is "possessed" for the time, but by the personality of the human agent to whom he has submitted himself. The process may be repeated till the will of the subject is broken down, and his higher faculties weakened, and all the depths of a humiliating inanity are touched. Readers of *David Elginbrod* will remember the story of the German mesmerist, and of the influence he acquired over a young lady who figures in the story. The young lady had become a mental paralytic in his presence, and was conscious of his approach when he was a considerable distance from the house in which she was living. The incident is not a simple creation of the writer's fancy. There are verified instances in which the unscrupulous mesmerist has carried his power to a criminal extent. Here you have all the pathological conditions required for the New Testament incidents. Possibly the paralysing influence that prepared the mind for these dark and distressing dominations was the shadow of Paganism, for nearly all the cases of possession are cases that occur where Pagan superstition was rampant, rather than in the purer centres of Jewish thought and life.

Amongst heathen people I have met cases of derangement that have seemed to come very near to those of the New Testament type. The fatalistic tone of heathen thought may favour this condition of mental helplessness and automatism. Under the influence of the Christian faith, the will may be so strengthened and the mind so replenished with light and knowledge, that the prostration is scarcely possible that leaves the soul helpless in the presence of the mysterious forces of darkness that prey upon it. Admit that malign and disturbing influences from the unseen may act upon the human soul, and these abnormal phenomena will be sure to appear where the will is terrorised into helplessness, and the defences of man's higher faculties dismantled by degrading forms of idolatry.

Some of the curious instances in which impressions have been transmitted from brain to brain without any of the ordinary processes of contact suggest the existence of occult laws of influence by which all the phenomena of possession might be brought about. Not a few marvellous illustrations of what has been called "telepathy" were brought together in the *Nineteenth Century* several years ago, and the names connected with the incidents put them beyond all possibility of question. The Rev. J. M. Wilson, headmaster of the Clifton College, Bristol, describes the strange impression that overpowered him when a student at Cambridge. One night a terrifying chill came over him. He seemed to have all the sensations of death. A fellow student endeavoured to cheer him. The strange feeling continued for some hours. The next day he heard that a twin brother in Leicestershire had died at the very time when he had these sensations of death. Mr. A. Severn, the artist, was staying at Brantwood, Coniston. He went for a sail on the lake before breakfast. A sudden change in the wind caused the tiller to swing round and strike him violently in the face. At the very hour his wife, who was

in bed, seemed to have received a blow, and actually put up a handkerchief to her lips. A workman in London felt an irresistible call to return home. On his arrival he found his wife had been run over by a cab, and had been crying out for him ever since. A Congregational minister of Woolwich had an impression of his brother's death in America at the time it was taking place, and also of his brother's wife's death; and crossed the Atlantic upon the strength of the second impression to take charge of the orphan children. In these cases, by some occult process of influence, one mind seemed to come for the time being under the dominion of a distant mind. The cases were those of momentary possession. If our conception of the freedom of spirits be correct, it will certainly be less credible that one human being should thus transfer his thoughts and sensibilities to another human being, and make them dominant for the time, than that a spirit should be able to rule over the sensibilities and nervous life and impulse of some poor wretch whose higher nature has become hypnotized.

The transfer of the man's madness, with the mysterious agents of it, to the swine, however strange, involves no impossibility, as Professor Huxley seems to admit. There is good reason for supposing that some dogs are thought-readers. An English sportsman in Norway says a Norsk dog obeyed all his orders, although it had not heard English spoken before, and the orders were not enforced by the least amount of pantomime. Domesticated animals will sometimes catch a man's moods of terror or depression. And it is more than suspected that groups of beasts have gone mad in the mass. The lower nature of the beast, without will or intelligence, unless of a very rudimentary order, would seem to make it a fit subject for the curious phenomena of possession. Professor Huxley, whilst claiming that the transfer of the demons to the swine con-

travenes probability, admits that he has "no *à priori* objection to offer." "There are physical things which can be transferred from men to pigs, and *vice versâ*, which do undoubtedly produce most diabolical and deadly effects on both. For anything I can absolutely prove to the contrary, there may be spiritual things capable of the same transmigration with like effect."

The insinuation that in this destruction of property there was a misdemeanour of evil example is too trivial from a serious and fair-minded man. Jesus regarded himself as a Jew, and if the Jewish law were binding on the eastern shore of the lake, the act of permission which issued in the destruction of the swine was perfectly justifiable. I have no doubt a Jew could have argued as forcibly against a hog-ranche as the professor himself would argue against a market for the sale of diseased meat. He ought surely to do Christ as much justice as he would a sanitary inspector who disregards the rights of property by laying hands on the horseflesh that is on its way to the shambles, or the revenue officer who seizes contraband tobacco or brandy. The passing of this mysterious power of derangement into the swine may have been necessary, as some one has pointed out, to the mental healing and assurance of the man. Looked at from that standpoint, all who are not Buddhists must surely refrain from any impeachment of an act that issued in the destruction of the swine. Man is paramount over both sheep and swine.

To affirm that the burning of witches in the Middle Ages was encouraged by these narratives of demoniacal possession is to wander very far afield indeed. Christ and His apostles treated all these cases as cases of suffering rather than transgression. The fact that they are represented as healed, and not hunted or bated or burned, ought to show both to the professor and to the Christian ecclesiastics who may have based their views of witchcraft

on such passages, that the things have nothing in common. The belief in witchcraft is independent of Bible teaching, and pagan rulers have often found that the peace of the State could only be maintained by its suppression. The fact of it is, that assassination rings, and secret murder societies, and poison leagues work, and have ever worked, under the cover of necromancy and divination. In savage countries the political parties divide themselves into government and opposition. The witches form the one and the witch-hunters the other, and the war between the inns and outs is war to the death. The professional sorcerer is quite distinct from the quasi-victim of demoniacal possession, as well as from the attendant in the temple who is visited by the spirit of the idol and made to utter trance oracles. Crime against life often hides itself under professional witchery and wizardry, and I dare say mediæval rulers punished the innocent in hunting out that crime as the innocent have been punished in all ages of the world and for every kind of supposed offence.

In some of these miracles it was necessary that Christ should dramatize the process to lay in the hearts of the healed and the saved the foundations of a sound faith in His own spiritual sovereignty. These cases of possession occur at the meeting places of Jewish and heathen religions. Faith in the supremacy of God over evil had been lost or compromised. If the ignorant sufferer was to be delivered from every form of Manicheism or degraded and terror-stricken Fetich-worship, he must be assured of his Healer's sovereignty over the evil powers that have harrassed him in the past. Some of the details of these incidents that affront the scientific reason were necessary to complete that assurance.

T. G. SELBY. /

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON MY HEBREW
NEW TESTAMENT.

II.

PROFESSOR E. SCHUERER in an article on "The Idea of the Kingdom of Heaven as set forth in Jewish Writings," in the *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* for 1876, has endeavoured to show that מלכות שמים in post-biblical Jewish literature is quite the same as מלכות האלהים, *kingdom of God*. In his *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, second edition, vol. ii., p. 171, he repeats his statement and confirms the result of his careful inquiry. One of his chief arguments is this, that as מלכות השמים never occurs, but in every case simply שמים without the article, it is like a proper name which is determinate in itself. With the exception of הקדוש ברוך הוא, *the Holy One, blessed be He*, there is no name of God more commonly used than שמים. Everywhere in the two Talmuds and in the Midrashim we meet with phrases like the following: ירא שמים, *fearing God*; מורא שמים or יראת שמים, *the fear of God*; שם שמים, *the name of God*, etc. What Josephus says about the Pharisees' doctrine of predetermination and liberty is confirmed by the Talmudic maxim, "All is in the hands of Heaven save the fear of Heaven"; that is, piety or impiety depends upon man's own will. This reads in Hebrew: הכל בידי שמים חוץ מיראת שמים (*Berachoth*, 33b). And what in this utterance is called יראת שמים is elsewhere more exactly defined as קבל מלכות שמים, *reception of the kingdom of heaven*; or קבל עול מלכות שמים, *taking up of the yoke of the kingdom of heaven*. Everywhere from the Mishna down to the Jewish Siddur or Prayerbook מלכות שמים is quite a common phrase, whereas מלכות השמים never once occurs.

It cannot indeed be proved that in biblical Hebrew

heaven is ever used as the name of God. But in the book of Daniel we seem to have something like the transition to this use of the word. There in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in chap. iv., in one sentence, vers. 23, 29, we have the phrase, "the Most High ruleth," followed by the equivalent phrase, "the Heavens do rule," where שמים with indifferent article is used. And if we turn our attention to the term "*kingdom of heaven*," we shall find that there is only one passage in the New Testament¹ in which "heaven" is employed as an equivalent of "God"; viz. in the parable of the Prodigal Son in Luke xv., where the penitent says to his father, Πάτερ, ἡμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου, *Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight*. Evidently he intended to say, to express ourselves talmudically according to *Sanhedrin* 27a, that he had been רע לשמים ורע לבריות, that is, *bad toward God and toward men*. The Hebrew equivalent here is לשמים ולפניך. The fact that the Greek text has εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν and not εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς might have afforded a valuable hint as to the correct rendering of the phrase. Nevertheless both in Salkinson's Hebrew New Testament and in my own it has been rendered by לשמים with the article. This is an error that requires correction.

On the other hand, the translation of the New Testament phrase βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, though peculiar to the Hebrew-Christian gospel of Matthew, and never interchanged with βασιλεία τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, by the Hebrew phrase מלכות השמים is perfectly correct and quite irreprehensible, because ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is really, though not logically, the same as ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ of the other evangelists, and is by no means identical with מלכות שמים of the synagogue. I refer my readers to the article in Cremer's *Biblico-*

¹ For Luke xviii. 13 is not to be regarded as a case in point. There εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν signifies "up to heaven," and is rendered in my version לַשָּׁמַיִם, and by Salkinson לְמָרוֹם.

Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, especially to the fifth edition of that work in the German, published in 1888. The evangelical notion is fuller and deeper and wider. The *kingdom of heaven* (heavens) is the new system of the world, appointed and governed by God in His Christ, a new system of heavenly origin, of heavenly nature and universal extent, comprehending as well the heavenly as the earthly world, and some way transforming the earth into heaven as the fulfilment of the prayer, "Thy will be done on earth as in heaven."

In the translation of *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* however, we are presented with a case altogether different from the question of the translation of *Kaïσαρ*. The Hebrew rendering קיסר, must be given, just like the Greek rendering *Kaïσαρ*, in every case without the article. I know of only a single instance in the Talmud in which קיסר has the post-positive Aramaic article; namely, in the *Aboda zara* 10b, where the question is raised, מאי הוי דההוא קיסרא דהוה, *What is the matter with that emperor who was*, etc.? But even in this case there are certain manuscripts, such as that of Munich, which give קיסר, and that too is the rendering of the celebrated extract of the Talmudic Haggadoth (*Stories and Sentences*) entitled "En-Jacob."

As the emperor is always rendered קיסר, not הקיסר, and God always שמים, not השמים, so we may conclude that the Hebrew equivalent for *ζωή αἰώνιος* is not חיי העולם, but חיי עולם. This too is another point in which my translation is in need of improvement. Salkinson has quite correctly used חיי עולם without the article. The question, however, now presents itself as to whether this rendering is sufficient as an equivalent for the determinate phrase *ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή* or *ἡ ζωή ἡ αἰώνιος*. The discussion of this point must be reserved for our third paper.

III.

In the biblical Hebrew, and likewise in the biblical Aramaic, the noun עולם, of the same form as חורם, a signet ring, means in every case a period of long endurance (αἰών), and in no case the temporal world (κόσμος). There is only one passage, and that in *Ecclesiastes* iii. 11, a book belonging to the very latest age of biblical Hebrew, in which with any show of plausibility "the world" might be given as the equivalent of העולם. But even there the rendering of the margin of the Revised Version, "Also He hath set eternity in their heart," is preferable to that of the text. The idea of the writer is: The thought of eternity, the yearning after infinity, is implanted in the human soul.

The biblical usage allows us without the slightest risk of ambiguity to say not only חיים עד-העולם (Ps. cxxxiii. 3), but also ייח העולם, as well as חיי עולם (Daniel xii. 2). Indeed in the seventh verse of this same chapter of Daniel God is called חי העולם, He who liveth for ever, or eternally.

On the contrary, in the post-biblical Hebrew, both as spoken and written, a clear and well-defined distinction was made between חיי העולם, *life of the world*, and חיי עולם, *eternal life*. When used to denote eternity, עולם never has the article. The Hebrew translator of the New Testament cannot forbear using עולם as a homonym for αἰών and κόσμος, and must, for that very reason, the more carefully observe that difference in usage just indicated between העולם, *the world*, and עולם, *eternity*. It is quite right to translate ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς (John vi. 51) by בעד חיי העולם, as is done in Salkinson's version and my own; πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου (1 Cor. ii. 12) by רוח העולם, as is also done in both; τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου (1 John iii. 17) by נכסי העולם (where Salkinson more biblically, as he thinks, but not so properly, renders הון בארץ); and in Christ's inter-

cessory prayer, ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (John xvii. 16), by אֵינִי מִן־הָעוֹלָם, as is done in both. But the equivalent for αἰώνιος ζωή is חַיִּי עוֹלָם. This is the rendering given to the phrase in my translation of Matthew xxv. 46, Luke x. 25, John xii. 50; but I confess ingenuously that my lamented friend has been more consistent than I have been in the regular omission of the article in such cases.

There are several passages however in which the Greek text has ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, or ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, or ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Now in such instances, where the notion of eternal life is conceived of in so determinate a way, it is quite necessary that the grammatical form of expression should be correspondingly determinate. The translator may indeed seek to get over the difficulty by using חַיִּי נָצַח or חַיִּי עָד, because נָצַח and עָד, in the sense of "the everlasting," "the eternal," never take the article, but without it have the idea of determinateness in themselves. But this device is, after all, only a half measure, which does not succeed in removing altogether the ambiguity. We have a better expedient, of which Salkinson has not made any use; while I myself have made a very liberal use of it, but, unfortunately, very seldom in the proper place. In John xvii. 3 we read, αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή. For this distinctly assertory form of the original Salkinson substitutes the interrogatory phrase, וּמָה חַיִּי עוֹלָם, and *what is eternal life?* In my translation, on the other hand, וְאֵלֶּה הֵם חַיִּי הָעוֹלָמִים is not only literal, but, as I am about to show, unquestionably idiomatical.

The benediction, בְּרָכָה, which ought to be repeated by any one who undertakes to read the book of the Thorah, has in *Massecheth Thorah* xiii. 8 the following ancient form: "Blessed be Thou, O Lord, who hast given us a law from the heavens," חַיִּי הָעוֹלָמִים מִמְּרוֹמִים, "*the eternal life from the heights.*" When closing the book he says, "Blessed be the Lord, who has given us a law of truth, and has

implanted in us **חיי עולם**," or, according to another reading, **חיי העולמים**.

The same tendency to vacillate between **חיי עולם** and **חיי העולמים** is to be found at the close of the treatise of the Mishna entitled *Tamid*, which deals with the daily morning and evening sacrifices. There the inscription of the ninety-second Psalm, "A Song for the Sabbath Day," is interpreted, "*for the day which is entire Sabbath and rest for eternal life.*" The text of the Mishna here varies between **חיי העולמים** and **ומנוחה לחיי עולמים**. The Mishna on which the Palestinian Talmud rests, edited by W. H. Lowe from the unique Cambridge manuscript (1883), has **ומנוחה לחיי העולמים**; and in this form the phrase is received into the blessing used at the table (see Baer, *Abodath Israel*, Siddur with Commentary, p. 561). Yet, even in this case, the reading fluctuates, and an old text issued at Treves in A.D. 1525 gives **חיי עולם**, without the article.

The result of the investigation is, that $\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \zeta\omega\eta$, wherever it is necessary to express distinctly the determinateness of the phrase, can be idiomatically rendered by **חיי העולמים**, and that $\zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ can be rendered either by **חיי עולם** or **חיי העולמים**; but that **חיי העולם** for "eternal life" is equivocal, or not agreeable to the usage of post-biblical Hebrew, nor even, it appears from Daniel xii. 2, to that of biblical Hebrew.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.

RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IN 1849 Dr. James Morison delivered and published a course of lectures *On the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans*. These lectures he has frequently been asked to reprint. Instead of doing so he has remodelled and rewritten them, and now publishes an *Exposition* of the same chapter. Dr. Morison's learning, industry, and fairness have won for him a large audience, and his present volume will quite sustain his reputation. It is interesting to note in this exposition his impartiality as an expositor contending with his theological presuppositions. Sometimes he seems, unconsciously to himself, to make admissions which open the gate to full-blown Calvinism; at other times he strains his text to make Paul speak the language of Arminius. The unprejudiced reader will still find Calvinism in this chapter; and, able as Dr. Morison is, he will scarcely persuade his readers that Paul was not a believer in absolute predestination.—The same chapter is handled with similar result in Mr. Sadler's *Epistle to the Romans, with Notes Critical and Practical* (George Bell & Sons). Mr. Sadler's commentaries are always welcome. They are written in a devout spirit and with care. Tainted a little his exposition is with extreme sacramentarian views, but the error is easily eliminated, and the residuum is eminently edifying. Even those who totally differ from Prebendary Sadler in his interpretation of crucial passages will allow that he defends his views with vigour. For English readers this commentary furnishes in a readable form the results of much reading and thought.

It may not be out of place to remind our readers that a work of great and permanent value has been produced by Dr. James Drummond, to whom already the theological world owes so much. His present work, though not bearing so directly on exposition as *The Jewish Messiah*, has yet very obvious relation to the interpretation of the New Testament writings. It is entitled *Philo-Judeus; or, The Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion*, and is published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate. There has hitherto been a very manifest gap in English theological and philosophical literature, which Dr. Drummond's volumes now adequately fill. The task of reading Philo is a hard one; to frame a coherent philosophy out of his allegorising interpretations

of Scripture and eclectic speculation is still harder; and perhaps hardest of all is to assign him his due place historically. To these tasks Dr. Drummond has set himself with true scholarly zeal, and has fought his way through the difficulties with admirable success. The blending of Hellenism and Judaism which prepared the way for Philo is expounded at length, and with much independence. Here Dr. Drummond is on familiar ground, and many of Gfrörer's opinions are contested with reason and force. The doctrine of the Logos is dealt with at great length, and with eminent fairness. The whole work is a credit to English learning, and should stimulate philosophical studies.

MARCUS DODS.

BREVIA.

Second Twilights and Old Testament Miracles.—A committee of the Royal Society was appointed some time ago to collect all accessible information upon the subject of the volcanic eruptions which took place on the island of Krakatoa in August, 1883. The report of that commission has just been issued, and a most instructive and fascinating volume it is. The various data are illustrated by maps, drawings, and diagrams, and six water-colour sketches of the wonderful skies seen in England shortly after the eruption.

The remarkable glows of colour seen in the late autumn of 1883, long after sunset, will be fresh in the recollection of most students of nature. Within a few days or weeks of the eruptions this phenomenon attracted attention in Australia, Honolulu, China, Japan, and in almost every part of Europe. After sunset, a first flush of colour appeared, lasting fifty minutes, followed after a while by a second, lasting in many instances nearly an hour and a half. The sunset scale of colour was inverted, the glow of singular brilliance and its continuance into the far night almost unexampled. In tropical latitudes, the sky-effect was sometimes mistaken by the sailors for the northern lights.

The evidence brought together tends to show that these highly tinted clouds were formed by extremely minute particles of vitreous pumice-dust held in suspension in the upper region of the atmosphere. For hundreds of miles along the coasts of Java and

Sumatra dust fell, the analysis of which justified this conclusion. It was probably formed by the expansion of gases or steam at the time of the explosion and ground into these microscopic fragments by the eruptive force of the volcano. The particles, it has been calculated, were between one twenty-five-thousandth and one two-hundred-thousandth of an inch in thickness, and the stratum they formed extended from eighty to one hundred and twenty thousand feet above the surface of the sea. As windows burn with the ruddy reflections of the setting sun, these glass-like particles of pumice-dust, held in suspension at a height within reach of the sun's rays after he had passed the horizon, are supposed to have returned his illumination to the darkening earth.

The report contains an interesting list of past eruptions which have been followed by similar spectacles. 1831 was a year of marked volcanic activity. Eruptions are recorded of Etna, Vesuvius, and some of the Central American volcanoes. "The extraordinary dry fog of that year was observed in the four quarters of the world. The sky was never dark at midnight, and even in August small print could be read in Siberia, at Berlin, and Genoa. On August 3rd, at Berlin, the sun must have been nineteen degrees below the horizon when small print was legible at midnight."

On September 2nd, 1845, Hecla was in eruption. "Near London, on September 6th, 1845, at 6 p.m., there was a brilliant orange-coloured sky and brilliant and clear sunset. The sun's disk was silvery white as it touched the horizon. The solar rays were visible at 10 p.m., downwards and upwards."

Eruption of Hecla, 1846. "From the middle of April to the end of May there was an extraordinary after-glow in Switzerland. It lasted one hour thirty minutes on May 21st, one hour twenty minutes May 23rd, one hour twenty-five minutes May 28th, and forty-five minutes May 31st. It had the appearance of a column or pillar of red light, and was at one place attributed to a supposed conflagration."

It is perhaps a far cry from Krakatoa to Beth-horon. If the story of these marvellous phenomena had been found in the Bible, what scepticism we should have shown in accepting it! Had we read in the book of Joshua or the prophecies of Isaiah that a month and a half after Midsummer Day small print was read at midnight in one of the capitals of Europe without the aid of lamp

or candle, the less reverent of the unbelievers would have found in the bare statement a fund of amusement that would have lasted their successive generations of disciples for centuries. And yet, however little science the Bible historians may have had, they have every claim to be regarded as trustworthy witnesses of the facts they record. We speak sometimes as if the capacity for accurate observation had sprung up within the last thirty years. As a matter of fact, through the division of labour in our overcrowded civilizations, the capacity for direct observation tends to decline, if not to quite die out. What *has* grown is the scientific aptitude to explain and classify facts, not the trustworthy eye to note them. The Israelites, fresh from the vigils of the wilderness, their lusty descendants in the times of Hezekiah, were just as competent to observe all the facts that address the eye as are any of us. Our superiority consists rather in finding the right place for our facts in the complex system of nature.

Is it not possible to explain the prolongation of the light on the evening of the battle of Beth-horon, poetically described as "the standing still of the sun," by one of these after-glows to which the attention of the scientific world has been recently directed? May not the stones rained down from heaven upon the kings in their flight have been volcanic ash and pumice? The battlefield was not many miles away from an age-long centre of volcanic disturbance. In the eruption of 1883 ash and pumice-stone were carried incredible distances, and burnt the clothes and skin of those upon whom they fell. Possibly some who choose to regard the after-glows of 1883 as meteoric in their origin may think that the late Dean Stanley has dismissed too lightly the idea that the stones which fell upon the kings in their flight were meteoric. Would not the meteoric, no less than the volcanic, theory explain both the stones from heaven and the protraction of the twilight for the last crowning act of the wonderful battle?

May not the going back of the sun ten degrees on the dial of Ahaz, as the sign of Hezekiah's recovery, be also explained by one of these marvellous second twilights? Some observers of the recent after-glows describe their position as twelve or fifteen degrees above the horizon. Is there not something in this rough coincidence of measurement? It may be said Isaiah gave the king his choice of a sign, for he promised that the shadow should go either backwards or forwards. The objection is perhaps not

formidable, for at the time of the Java eruptions there were fore-glows before sunrise darkening back again for a time into night, as well as after-glows ensuing upon the sunsets. If these records had been found anywhere else than in a sacred book, they would probably have long since been accepted as hints of some genuine optical phenomenon unknown as yet to modern science.

Upon either of these theories the miracles of course remain the same, although the clumsy expedient described as "a suspension of the laws of nature" is no longer necessary for their explanation. I am afraid some Christians revel in the grotesquely miraculous. There is a touch of ostentatious pharisaism in their faith, and to illustrate the superiority of their faith to that of the more rational people, who cannot accept a miracle if it involve what seems an impossible method, they delight to make the miraculous elements of the Bible history as *bizarre* as possible. The more portentous the wonder they can digest, the grander, it is assumed, the spiritual health of which they are the show specimens. Such persons will probably still delight to think of the earth as though it were a racing man's stop-watch, and could be pulled up at a moment without disaster, and after an interval started again. If these signs over Gibeon and on the sun-dial of Ahaz be explicable by after-glows, difficulties may be removed from the path of many to whom the old conception of the method of the miracles has been a stumbling-block. And yet at the same time the providential character of the narratives is not destroyed. The coincidence of these after-glows with the necessities of Joshua's campaign against the kings and with the recovery of Hezekiah from his sickness, and the prediction of these coincidences by Joshua and Isaiah, will sufficiently vindicate the supernatural providence of these events. The miracles will assume a prophetic rather than a thaumaturgic type. The Bible writers record what was seen, and never commit themselves to theories of the processes by which the wonders they relate were effected. If we hesitate to commit ourselves to this hypothesis of the miracles, the curious information brought together in the report referred to will at least serve to show how much remains to be learned in the domain of natural law, and should warn us against an attitude of contempt towards the miraculous elements in the Old Testament histories.

T. G. SELBY.

THE DOUBLE TEXT OF JEREMIAH.

IN the Book of Jeremiah, the text of the Septuagint, as is well known, differs more widely from the Hebrew than is ordinarily the case in the Old Testament. In the other books of the Old Testament, the variations are, perhaps, the most marked and important in the cases of 1 and 2 Samuel and Ezekiel; but in the prophecies of Jeremiah they are more considerable still. In the text of the Septuagint, as compared with the Hebrew, there are very numerous omissions, sometimes of single words, sometimes of particular clauses or passages, there are occasionally additions, there are variations of expression, there are, lastly, transpositions. The number of words in the Hebrew text which are not represented in the Septuagint has been calculated at 2,700, or one-eighth of the entire Book. It must not, however, be concluded from these figures that the *substance* of the prophecies is proportionately diminished, for many of the omissions consist of words which have no appreciable bearing upon the sense, such as the title *the prophet* attached to the name "Jeremiah," or the parenthetic "saith the Lord" (where the fact itself is plain from the context), or the substitution of "the Lord" by itself for the fuller title "the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel," or other similarly abbreviated forms of expression. Other omissions are, of course, more important, as 10, 6-8. 10. 11, 7-8 (except the last words "and they did them not"). 29, 14 (except "And I will be found of you"). 16-20. 33, 14-26; and several times (but not always) where the words, as read in the existing Hebrew text, *appear elsewhere* in the Book, 8, 10^b-12 (see 6, 13-15). 17, 1-4 (with 3^b. 4^b comp. 15, 13-14). 30, 10-11

(see 46, 27-28). 39, 4-13 (4-10 in the Hebrew text abridged¹ from 52, 7-16). 48, 40^b. 41^b (see 49, 22). The additions in the Septuagint are unimportant, and need not detain us. Illustrations of variations of expression will be referred to subsequently. The transpositions, so far as they concern words or clauses (*e.g.* "prophet and priest" for "priest and prophet," or the altered position of "saith the Lord" in 1, 19. 3, 16 and elsewhere), though there are many such instances in the course of the Book, are also of subordinate importance. The really important difference of order between the Septuagint and Hebrew text is in the position assigned to the prophecies on foreign nations, chapters 46-51. These, which in the Hebrew text are placed at the end of the entire Book (being only followed by the historical chapter 52 (=2 Kings 24, 18-25, 30, usually in a purer text), which the note at the end of 51, 64 shows was not regarded by the compiler as Jeremiah's work), are arranged in the Septuagint so as to follow 25, 13—the second part of this verse, in the form *The things which Jeremiah prophesied concerning the nations*, forming a superscription to them, ver. 14 being omitted, and the entire group being followed by vers. 15-38 (ver. 15 beginning *Thus said the Lord the God of Israel*), which afford indeed an excellent and appropriate sequel to them. The order of the nine prophecies composing the group is also different in the Septuagint, as well as the position occupied by the group as a whole.

These variations between the two texts of Jeremiah have for long been noticed by commentators and critics, and many hypotheses have been proposed for the purpose of accounting for them. By some, the variations have been attributed to the carelessness of copyists in transcribing the version of the Septuagint;² by others, to the incom-

¹ Comp. especially ver. 8 with 52, 12-14.

² Jerome, Prologue to Commentary on Jeremiah ("librarium errore confusum"). This explanation is certainly insufficient.

petence and arbitrariness of the LXX translators themselves;¹ others have thrown the source of the variations further back, supposing them to arise from the fact that the existing Hebrew text, and the text from which the LXX translation was made, exhibit *two different recensions* of Jeremiah's writings, and regarding (as the case may be) the one or the other of these as representing more faithfully the prophet's own words.² It is evident that the problem which the double text presents can never be solved by the *à priori* method of starting with a fixed conviction as to the necessary or inherent superiority of one of the two texts above the other: the only method by which its solution can be successfully attempted is by a systematic investigation of the differences which the two texts present, and a careful comparison of individual cases for the purpose of ascertaining on which side the superiority lies. And by several of the writers named this has been done, with more or less completeness, though the conclusions to which they have been led have not always been the same. The case is one, no doubt, in which it is difficult to establish a perfectly objective standard; and hence different critics obtain different results. An impartial and judicious estimate of the claims that have been advanced on both sides is given by Kuenen.³

¹ So De Wette (originally), Wichelhaus, Nägelsbach, Graf, Keil (though admitting that in particular cases better readings have been preserved in LXX).

² So, but differing widely in their estimate of the fidelity with which the LXX translators reproduced the text of their recension, J. D. Michaelis, Movers, De Wette (later, following Movers), Ewald (*Prophets*, iii. 91 f. Engl. tr.), Bleek (*Introduction to the O.T.* §§ 214-218 [in Wellhausen's edition, 1878, §§ 191-195]), Kuenen, Hitzig (*Commentary*, ed. 2, 1866, pp. xv-xviii), the Dean of Canterbury (in the *Speaker's Commentary*, p. 324 f.), Scholz (*Der Massoretische Text und die LXX-Üebersetzung des Buchs Jeremias*, 1875). These scholars, however, mostly prefer themselves the text of LXX only with reserve, and admit, especially Ewald (who indeed practically follows the LXX hardly more than Graf), that the translators performed their work with more or less arbitrariness and neglect. The Dean of Canterbury, however, absolves the translators from these faults, but thinks that the MS. used by them was one that had been transcribed in haste.

³ *Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek*, etc. (1863), ii. pp. 240-249.

The foregoing remarks have been suggested by a work in which the entire subject has been taken up afresh, published recently by an American professor, the Rev. E. C. Workman.¹ Prof. Workman has devoted much independent study to the comparison of the two texts; and the task has evidently been with him a labour of love. The contents of the volume, stated briefly, are as follows. After some preliminary remarks on the general relation subsisting between the existing Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Septuagint translation, Prof. Workman in his first chapter surveys the different explanations which have been offered of the variations occurring in the Book of Jeremiah, and states the method which he proposes to follow himself. The five following chapters are devoted to a discussion of these variations, which are classified in order; *viz.* the omissions, additions, transpositions, alterations, substitutions. Chap. vii. is an examination of the causes to which the variations may be due; chap. viii. consists of an estimate of the value of the LXX translation; chap. ix. sums up the results of the entire investigation. Chap. x., however, will be to many the most attractive part of the work. This is headed, "The Conspectus of the Variations," and contains in two parallel columns, occupying 116 pages, all the passages in which the two texts differ, the Hebrew word (or words) being transcribed in one column, and the other column exhibiting the reading underlying the LXX translation, as restored by Prof. Workman. For this, the most novel part of his work, Prof. Workman states in his preface that he has had the assistance of a Jewish scholar, Dr. S. Mandelkern; and we may say at once that, judged merely as a piece of Hebrew translation, it is excellently done.

¹ *The Text of Jeremiah; or, a Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the variations in the LXX, retranslated into the Original and Explained.* By the Rev. E. C. Workman, M.A., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Literature in Victoria University, Cobourg, Ont., Canada. With an Introductory Notice by Prof. Franz Delitzsch, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889.)

There are occasional oversights, though seldom serious ones;¹ and the Hebrew, as a rule (judged apart from the context to which it is presumed to belong), is bright and idiomatic.

We turn, however, to the wider and more important question. Has Prof. Workman advanced the subject with which he deals? From what we had heard, we had cherished great expectations as to what Prof. Workman's book would accomplish; and we perused it, when it appeared, with great interest: we regret therefore the more to find ourselves compelled to answer this question in the negative. We are very far from desiring to disparage Prof. Workman's labours. His honesty, his industry, his singlemindedness are conspicuous upon every page; but we are bound to say that the *methods* by which he has carried on his work appear to us to be radically unsound. He starts with the assumption of principles which really have first to be proved. He is a warm advocate of the claims of the Septuagint version; and in his reaction against the depreciation with which it has been viewed in some quarters, in particular by Graf, he invests its translators with ideal excellences, and can discover in their work hardly any blemishes. He thinks indeed, that unless the translator possessed the fullest qualifications which the learning and training of the Alexandrian schools of the time could confer, he would not have been selected

¹ Thus 3, 3 כִּי־אֵין will not construe; 6, 8 תוֹכֵר should be 2 fem.; 6, 12 וְנִשְׁתִּיהֶם is a strange error for וְנִשְׁתִּיהֶם; 9, 15 read בְּלֹתֶם (so 49, 37); 10, 23 יִלְךָ for יִלְךָ; 12, 16 וּנְבִנָה; 15, 18 מִאֲנָה is an impossible form; 18, 21 וְהִצִּיבָם do.; 22, 27 לְבָל is not biblical; 23, 31 the inf. abs. should be נֹם; 25, 15 וְהִצִּיבָם may have been read by the LXX translators, but cannot have been written by Jeremiah; 25, 29 בְּאֵשׁ the syntax is incorrect; 28, 1. הַשֶּׁקֶר הַנְּבִיא the syntax is incorrect; 28, 1. וְהִצִּיבָם should be וְהִצִּיבָם (or וְהִצִּיבָם); 32, 44 וְהִצִּיבָם is not correct; 41, 5 שְׂמֵנִים אֲנִשִּׁים do.; 49, 25 read אֲחָבוּ; 51, 20. 21. 22 וְהִצִּיבָם is an error for וְהִצִּיבָם; 51, 27 הָרָמוּ for הָרָמוּ (ἀπαρε); 51, 39 יִרְדָּמוּ for יִרְדָּמוּ.

for such an arduous and important task (p. 7 f.). He believes (pp. 217, 281) that the book was translated with the utmost carefulness, "as literally as the genius of the flexible Greek language would allow, the translator or translators having in no way arbitrarily changed the original Hebrew text, and having in no instance been influenced either by personal scruple, theological bias, or religious tendency."

These contentions, however, are based, in fact, on *à priori* considerations. There is no more sufficient reason for supposing that the translator of Jeremiah was selected on the ground of his special qualifications, than for supposing that the translator of the Minor Prophets was so selected; and if so, we fancy that Prof. Workman will admit either that the Hebrew text of the Minor Prophets used by the translator was often in a singularly defective state, or that Hebrew scholarship at Alexandria must have been at a low ebb. Whichever alternative be accepted, the conclusion is not favourable to the unconditional and necessary superiority claimed on behalf of the LXX version of Jeremiah. This parallel is, however, only adduced for the purpose of showing the fallacy of the *à priori* argument: the question of the *actual* comparative value of the Hebrew and LXX remains as before; and the only method by which this can be ascertained is by *comparing the two together*, and where they differ by considering which is better in accord, (a) with the general standard of well-established Hebrew usage, (b) with the standard supplied in particular by the parts of Jeremiah where the two texts *agree*. When this has been done, we believe that it will appear that the translators have by no means proceeded with the scrupulousness and precision which Prof. Workman attributes to them. They have permitted themselves, in one word, like most other ancient translators, to *paraphrase*, to make additions, alterations, and omissions, especially *slight* ones, to a far greater

extent than Prof. Workman allows for. Hence his restoration of the presumed Hebrew original upon which their translation was based rests in large measure upon *illusion*; the variations which he and Dr. Mandelkern so patiently reproduce in Hebrew are, in very many cases, simply more or less paraphrastic renderings of the same Hebrew text which we possess ourselves! We entirely agree with Prof. Workman that much has been laid to the charge of the translators (especially by Graf and Keil) of which they are guiltless: in other words, we accept cordially the main principle for which he contends, *viz.* that the deviations, in a large number of cases, were already present in the MS. used by them, *i.e.* that they were *recensional*; and our agreement with him in his main thesis causes us to regret the more that he has shown so little power of discriminating between real and only apparent recensional variations, and has in consequence failed in the main object which he set himself, *viz.* to exhibit, in a perspicuous and convenient form, *the approximate text of the recension which was in the hands of the Greek translators.*

We proceed to offer specimens of Prof. Workman's method, which we hope may be regarded as sufficient to substantiate what we have alleged. It will be remembered that there are throughout *two* questions, which are distinct from one another: 1. What is the Hebrew text underlying the LXX translation? 2. Is this text preferable to the existing Hebrew text? Prof. Workman's answer to the first question is stated very fully and clearly; it occupies the whole of the long chapter headed "The Conspectus of the Variations." The second question he does not answer systematically, but he gives the reader to understand that though he does not suppose the text represented by LXX to be entirely free from error, he is very generally disposed to prefer it to the Hebrew text which we at present possess.

The Hebrew word שרירות *firmness*, in a bad sense, *obstinacy*, occurs in Jeremiah eight times; as the LXX, however, express it by a word of a different meaning, it is inferred by Prof. Workman that they had a different text before them, which is restored by him accordingly. Thus 3, 17 ἐνθυμήματα, W. מועצות; 9, 13. 16, 12. 18, 12 τὰ ἀρεστά, W. תְּאוֹת; 23, 17 πλάνη, W. תְּעִית: in 11, 8 and 13, 10 the word is not represented in LXX; perhaps also not in 7, 24, though it seems to us that במועצות is the word which is here not represented, and that שרירות is expressed, as in 3, 17, by ἐνθυμήματα. There is not the smallest basis for any one of these supposed restorations. Prof. Workman has overlooked the fact that in the two other places where the word occurs in the Old Testament, Deuteronomy 29, 18. Ps. 81, 13, it is represented in LXX by ἀποπλάνησις (as by πλάνη in Jeremiah 23, 17) and ἐπιτηδεύματα: if these do not satisfy him that the LXX in all cases read the same word which we now have (though, not understanding it etymologically,¹ they rendered it by words more or less suggested by the context), then, as it is not to be supposed (upon his principles) that the translators of Deuteronomy and the Psalms were *less* trustworthy than the translator of Jeremiah, he is landed in one of these extraordinary conclusions, either, *viz.* that שרירות, an actual Hebrew word, was seven (or eight) different times expunged from the MSS. used by the LXX, or that three distinct words, standing originally in the seven (or eight) passages, were changed in the Massoretic text to a word not otherwise occurring in Hebrew at all! We venture to think that every reasonable critic will admit that the "restorations" in the cases referred to are one and all

¹ As the other ancient translators did not understand it, and hence render differently: thus Pesh. always ܕܚܩܩܝܢ *wishes*; Targum היררהו *imagination*; Aquila σκολίστης, whence no doubt Jerome's *pravitas*; Symmachus ἀρεσκεία (see the *Hexapla* on Ps. 81, 13); Saadyah in Deut. ܕܚܩܩܝܢ *desire*.

imaginary, and that the LXX in each passage read precisely the same consonantal text¹ which we read now.

We proceed to consider some passages taken at random. 7, 26 ויקשו את ערפם LXX ἐσκλήρυναν τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν. Τράχηλος, however, happens sometimes to express צואר; and hence Prof. Workman forthwith restores this word as the reading of LXX here. In doing this he neglects *three* facts: (1) that τράχηλος also represents ערף (as Deuteronomy 10, 16. 31, 27 and elsewhere, *in the same phrase*); (2) that הקשה צואר is an unidiomatic combination (unless, to be sure, it can be proved that wherever *hardness of neck* is spoken of in the Hebrew Bible—some seventeen times—ערף is always an error for צואר!); (3) that he has himself left ערף הקשה without any alteration in 17, 23 and 19, 15!—14, 7 our iniquities *testify* against us LXX ἀντέστησαν, whence W. קמו for ענו, producing a most improbable figure in this connexion (Job 16, 8 is different), and not noticing that ענה is rendered by exactly the same verb in LXX Deuteronomy 19, 18. Isaiah 3, 8, and especially in the very similar passage Isaiah 59, 12.—11, 14. 14, 12 רנה LXX δέησις, W. תחנון and תפלה, overlooking the fact that רנה, the cry of *prayer*, is constantly expressed by δέησις in the Psalms.—15, 21 עריצים oppressors LXX λοιμῶν, W. strangely תחלואים (*sicknesses*!) But λοιμὸς expresses the same Hebrew word עריץ in Ezek. 28, 7. 30, 11. 31, 12. 13.—18, 10 have done evil *in my sight* (בעיני) LXX ἐναντίον μου, W. לפני *before me*. But see 7, 28. 40, 4 where Prof. Workman himself does not suggest that the LXX had any reading differing from ours.—17, 27 *palaces* of Jerusalem, LXX ἄμφοδα, W. הצות; but 49, 26 no change! 6, 5 the same word is rendered θεμέλια; which of course suggests to Prof. Workman the reading יסודות. But ארמנות is represented six times in Amos 1–2, as well as elsewhere, by θεμέλια; and it is certain that it is one of the many words

¹ It may be admitted that they may have vocalized as a plur. (שורות).

the meaning of which was unknown to some of the LXX translators.—19, 5 nor did it come up upon my heart (a Hebrew idiom=nor did it enter into my mind: see Acts 7, 23), LXX οὐδὲ διανοήθηεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, W. ולא השבתי בלבי. It is true, LXX render the idiom literally in 3, 16. 32, 35. 44, 21; but it is far more probable that they were not perfectly uniform, than that such a weak expression should have been used as Prof. Workman restores (especially when it is remembered that the passage is *parallel* in thought to 7, 31. 32, 35); moreover, in 7, 31, where their rendering is exactly the same, he *makes no change*!—24, 8 and 25, 19 שריו LXX μεγιστᾶνες, whence W. concludes that they read גדוליו. Yet μεγιστᾶνες corresponds to שרים in 34, 10. 49, 33. 50, 35 (which he leaves unaltered!) and thrice in other books.—25, 30 the Lord shall *roar* . . . shall *mightily roar* against his fold, LXX χρηματιεῖ . . . λόγον χρηματιεῖ; W. יִדְבֵּר יִדְבֵּר יִדְבֵּר *will speak* . . . *will speak a word*. There is no doubt that Prof. Workman and his coadjutor can write excellent Hebrew *prose*; but do they seriously ask us to believe that the LXX *read* this *prose* in their MS.? Have they both forgotten Amos 1, 2, where LXX similarly paraphrase the figure by ἐφθέγγαστο? Is the entire Old Testament to be reconstituted upon the basis of a *literal* retranslation of the Septuagint Version? In the same verse, for *his fold* LXX have τόπου αὐτοῦ, W. accordingly מקומו *his place*. But (1) LXX paraphrase נוח similarly in Psalm 79, 7; and (2) where the same rendering occurs in 49, 19, no different reading is postulated by Prof. Workman himself!—32, 35 *to pass through* (the fire) to Moloch, LXX ἀναφέρειν *to offer*, W. להקריב. But Exodus 13, 12 ἀφελείς, Ezek. 16, 21 ἀποτροπιάζεσθαι for the same Hebrew word, show that the translators simply paraphrase: “*to pass through* (the fire) to Moloch” is a standing expression in Hebrew, “*to offer* to Moloch” is never found.—49, 18 like the overthrow of

Sodom and Gomorrha, 'וע' כַּמִּהֲפַכַת ס' LXX ὥσπερ κατεστράφη Σ. καὶ Γ., W. 'וע' כַּאֲשֶׁר נִהְפַּכְהָ ס' (a similar change in 50, 40). The LXX render likewise by a verbal form Deuteronomy 29, 22; Isaiah 13, 19; Amos 4, 11. But surely, because Greek idiom will not admit of the peculiar Hebrew construction being rendered literally, Prof. Workman does not propose to eliminate this classical expression from the pages of the Hebrew Bible? or even to suggest that, by some extraordinary freak of transmission, it was already, in *five different places*, corrupted into the inelegant form which he "restores," before the time when the LXX translation was made?—50, 11 תְּפֹשׂוּ LXX ἐσκιρτᾶτε, W. תִּפְּוּ (Gen. 49, 24), truly a case of "fumum ex fulgore." The LXX read exactly what we read, as is clear from their rendering of Malachi 3, 20.—50, 45 צִעִירֵי הַצֹּאן LXX τὰ ἀρνία τῶν προβάτων αὐτῶν, W. צִפִּירֵי צֹאנָם (goats of their flock!). But is not ἀρνία as venial a paraphrase of צִעִירֵי *little ones*, as it is of בְּנֵי *young ones* in Ps. 114, 4?

The use of the *infinitive*, in lieu of the finite verb, in certain circumstances, is a familiar and well substantiated Hebrew idiom, though one which it is naturally difficult, and even impossible, to reproduce in another language. It occurs several times in the Hebrew text of Jeremiah, sometimes (as 7, 9) with great force (Ewald, *Heb. Syntax*, § 328^b), and always in entire accordance with idiom. Because however LXX render, as they could not help rendering, by a *finite* verb, they are supposed to have had a finite verb in their text, which is everywhere restored—or rather corrupted—accordingly (3, 1. 7, 9. 18. 8, 15. 14, 5. 19. 22, 14. 23, 14. 32, 33. 36, 23. 37, 21). Because the expression יוֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם inhabitants of Jerusalem is sometimes rendered in LXX οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερ., they are supposed in such cases to have had in their MS. הַיּוֹשְׁבִים בִּירוּשָׁלַם (8, 1. 11, 2. 9. 17, 25. 19, 3 etc.), an expression never found in the Old Testament. Innumerable cases

also occur in which slight differences of tense, or number, or person, or construction (e.g. 5, 14; but contrast 7, 13. 18. 23, 38 etc.), or the substitution of a pronoun for an article, or the addition or absence of a small particle, etc., are supposed to point to different readings in the MS. used by the LXX,—as a rule, quite needlessly.

It is a peculiarity of Hebrew to employ a *singular*, in many cases, where a western language would use a plural. Thus Hebrew writers say often “your *heart*” instead of “your *hearts*”; and in general are apt to use *collective* terms in preference to true plurals, as *tear* for *tears*, *chariot* (or *chariotry*) for *chariots*, sometimes even *man* for *men*. Naturally in such cases, where the Hebrew has a singular term, the LXX have used a plural in accordance with the prevalent usage of the Greek language. Prof. Workman, however, believes that in all such cases—all, at least, which he has not overlooked—the LXX actually *had* plurals in the text which they used; and the plural for the singular figures in his “Conspectus of Variations” accordingly! Examples: 2, 22. 3, 2. 5, 7. 7, 22. 11, 20. 12, 9. 13, 17. 14, 20. 16, 18. 18, 23. 23, 14. 31, 33. 34, 32. 23. 36, 3. 47, 2. 48, 35. On account of the Greek *δάκρυα*, the unnatural דמעות for דמעה is restored in 8, 23. 9, 17. 13, 17. 14, 17. 31, 16. Where the Greek has ἄρματα, רכבים (which occurs *once* only in the Old Testament, Cant. 1, 9) or מרכבות is supposed always to have been read by the translators: 17, 25. 22, 4. 46, 9. 47, 3 (here in an impossible form רִכְבָּי), 50 37. 51 21. In 11, 11 Behold, I bring *evil* upon them, the LXX have κακά: accordingly רעות is declared to have been their reading; yet, by another of the inconsistencies which are so conspicuous in Prof. Workman’s book,¹ in 6, 19. 19, 3. 35,

¹ See besides those which have been noticed, 6, 22 compared with 25, 32. 31, 8. 50, 41; 6, 24 (where חבליים ביוֹלָדָה is contrary to usage) compared with 50, 43; 11, 22 with 29, 32; 14, 1 with 7, 22; 42, 20 with 42, 2. 7, 16. 11, 14. 14, 11 etc.

17. 45, 5, where the same phrase occurs, no change is considered necessary. Hebrew writers speak uniformly of delivering into the *hand* (not *hands*) of so and so—whether a singular or plural follows: LXX usually have εἰς χεῖρας, and בִּיד' is duly recorded as having been their reading (20, 4. 5. 21, 7. 10. 22, 25. 26, 24 and *passim*). On this we would observe that the *standing usage* of the Old Testament is בִּיד not בִּיד': which supposition then is the more probable? that the LXX simply wrote “into the *hands*” for “into the *hand*”; or—for these are the alternatives—either that the Hebrew text of the entire Old Testament is so corrupt that we do not know what was idiomatic in Hebrew and what was not, or that Jeremiah himself deserted the idiom of his own language, or that a scribe, who of course must also have been conversant with Hebrew, introduced *throughout the Book* this un-Hebrew expression?

Hitherto we have confined ourselves to the first of the questions stated above, and have endeavoured to show cause why we cannot accept Prof. Workman's restoration, as a genuine representation of the Hebrew text used by the LXX. Let us next approach his restoration from a different point of view, and (accepting it, provisionally, in the form in which he sets it before us) inquire how far it can claim superiority to the existing Hebrew text. We must be brief; and our opinion will perhaps be sufficiently indicated if we take two or three chapters and compare the two texts. In chap. ii. the conspectus exhibits seventy-five variations (or groups of variations) between the Hebrew and the presumed original of the LXX. Of these we should say that about twelve are, or might plausibly be argued to be, better than the corresponding readings in the Hebrew,¹

¹ 2, 6 שמה (see 51, 43); 12; 20 שברתי and נתקתי, and אעבוד (as the Kt.) 21 (though not as Prof. Workman restores, but as is suggested by Graf, viz. לקחתי, for לי כורי ה, cf. Deut. 32, 32 = πικρία); 27 ילדתי; 30 חרב, לקחתם, על-פלא-אלה; 53 דמי; 34 נם את הרעת לטמא; 33 שמו; 31 ולא יראתם.

about twenty-four are neutral—the sense differing so slightly, that it is impossible to say that either is superior to the other,—and about thirty-nine are decidedly worse, consisting often of phrases which Jeremiah himself could not possibly have written. We have no space here to examine the passages in detail; but we can assure our readers that we have considered them carefully, and without the smallest bias against the LXX. In chap. vii., out of some fifty-six variations (disregarding the two long omissions in vers. 1-2, 27), only one appears to us to offer a reading preferable to the Hebrew, *viz.* the omission in ver. 24 of (not בשררות, but) במועצות, “in counsels” (which from its imperfect construction may not improbably be a gloss); of the remaining fifty-five, about twenty-six appear to us to be neutral, and about twenty-nine inferior to the present Hebrew. We cannot however conceal our persuasion that the majority of these variations are not “recensional” at all, but are simply due to a slight freedom in rendering on the part of the translators, or (in some cases) to their having misread or misunderstood their Hebrew text. In point of fact, out of the fifty-six variations noted by Prof. Workman in chap. vii., we should say that about *twenty*¹ might fairly be treated as “recensional,” though whether they are all *actually* so is more than we can take upon ourselves to say,—probably not; the rest we should attribute, without the smallest hesitation, to one or other of the causes just indicated. *Mutatis mutandis*, our judgment would not be substantially

In his view of ררנו ver. 31 (p. 237), Prof. Workman has gone entirely astray. We cannot admit that the LXX translation proves רוך to mean “be lord,” but, allowing that it does, οὐ κυριευθησόμεθα would express not הלא ררנו (p. 286), but לא ירוך. And on p. 270, the originality of the inversion which he seeks to dispute, is surely confirmed by the usage of the *cognate languages*.

¹ *Viz.* the omissions in vers. 1-2, 3, 4 *end*, 10, 13 *bis*, 20, 21, 24 (במועצות), 26 *end*, 27, 28 *bis*; the addition in ver. 28^a (which agrees with the omission of ver. 27); and ver. 7 בארץ, 22 העלותי; 31 בַּמַּת; 32 הַהֲרָגָם; 34 שִׁמְחָם and שִׁמְחָם. We have endeavoured to be liberal to Prof. Workman; for it is not possible to be confident respecting some of these.

dissimilar in other parts of the book. We base this opinion largely upon general views. Though it is undoubted that the Septuagint preserves in many cases—perhaps indeed in more cases than is generally supposed—readings superior to those of the existing Hebrew text, it is also undoubted that in the vast majority of cases its readings are greatly inferior; so soon as it deviates from the Hebrew, a deterioration in force, and terseness, and idiomatic freshness at once, as a rule, begins to show itself. Can any qualified Hebrew scholar doubt that chaps. ii. and vii., read in the form in which Prof. Workman exhibits them, are inferior, both in intelligibility and force, to the form in which they appear in the Massoretic text? Upon grounds, not based (as we hope) upon an unreasoning prejudice, but of our *appreciation of Hebrew idiom*, we are thus compelled to conclude that, on the whole, the Massoretic text exhibits the prophecies of Jeremiah in their more original form; and this being so, it appears to us incredible that the vast amount of change, including many of the most violent and extravagant character—witness the stylistic *tours de force* in 2, 23-4. 25. 7, 16—could have been introduced into the text by any scribe, or series of scribes, or at any time. For the variations being mostly *significant*, they must have been due to design, and yet they are of a nature which it is impossible even to imagine any scribe as designedly making.¹ The alternative supposition, that, *to a certain extent*, more than is conceded by Graf and Keil, but considerably less than is contended for by Prof. Workman, the variations of LXX are recensional, but that, beyond this, they are due, partly to the MS. (or MSS.) used being in places imperfectly legible, partly to the fact that the translators either misunderstood the Hebrew, or permitted themselves some

¹ It is probably in its greater *conciseness of expression* that the text of LXX is most frequently superior in originality to the existing Hebrew text. But this seldom affects *style*.

freedom in rendering it, is surely both far more intelligible in itself, and altogether more in accordance with probability and analogy.¹

It is with sincere regret that we have found ourselves compelled to pass this unfavourable judgment upon Prof. Workman's volume. But truth obliges us to own that he is not equal to the task which he has undertaken. His judgments are crude, superficial, and inconsistent; and he is greatly deficient in the faculty of discrimination. In particular, he has not learnt the lesson of Wellhausen's monograph, *On the Text of the Books of Samuel*, in which the distinction between variations due only to the translators, and variations having their source in the MS. or MSS. used by them, *which alone*, as is obvious, *possess any value for the textual critic*, is repeatedly illustrated and enforced. Hence his volume to the textual critic is a disappointing one. He does not find in it what he expects to find, *viz.* a clear and well considered estimate, based on long and discriminating study of the book, of what *are* recensional variations; and he finds in it a great deal which is of no interest or importance to him whatever. Had Prof. Workman considered the variants individually, and eliminated from his *Conspectus* all those which may fairly be regarded as due solely to the translators, he would have produced a handbook which would have been of real service to the student of Jeremiah; as it is, his *Conspectus* bewilders by the mass of irrelevant and worthless material which it contains, and, to all but the trained scholar, is simply misleading. For the present, we hope that all who are interested in the prophecies of Jeremiah will provide themselves with Prof. Workman's volume; but we hope

¹ The *Targum*, to which Prof. Workman often appeals in support of his restorations, of course paraphrased likewise. It would be easy to show also that its evidence is often on other grounds inconclusive. Thus it *regularly* renders חיל by the plural חבלין; how then does its use of this word in 6, 24 show that it read חבלים rather than חיל?

also that they will follow it with the utmost possible discrimination. And for the future we earnestly trust that Prof. Workman may be induced to reconsider the plan upon which he has pursued his investigations; and in a future edition will not shrink from cutting down his *Con-spectus* to one-third or one-fourth—the more, the better—of its present dimensions.

S. R. DRIVER.

*OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM IN THE LIGHT
OF NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS.*

DURING the past half-century the attention of Hebrew scholars has been directed, perhaps more than at any former period, to the consideration of the text, and the structure of the books, of the Old Testament. The impulse to such studies had its rise a century earlier, but it was only here and there that a solitary student gave himself to the work. In our days the labourers have happily become more numerous. Their work too has been fruitful in results, and when what is certain in these inquiries becomes assured to the Church at large, we shall find that we have advanced greatly in our knowledge of these sacred books, and have gained clearer insight into the manner of God's revelation. But that time, though it be steadily approaching, has not yet arrived. Meanwhile the minds of many, who cannot examine the originals for themselves, grow sorely troubled by the questionings that are current, and not always couched in a reverent form, about matters which they have hitherto deemed unquestionable.

For much of this trouble no doubt the Churches themselves must be held responsible. All study and instruction concerning the origin and history of the Old Testament writings

has either been omitted by those who were responsible for imparting it, or else has been thrust very much into the background. It was no unnatural result of the Reformation that the authority of Scripture should be magnified. The reverence then generated grew in time to be somewhat superstitious. The instrument by which God had revealed Himself to His ancient people became regarded as partaking of the Divine perfection. The climax of letter-worship was reached when the reformed Churches of Switzerland, in 1675, declared that "the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, as we have received it from the Jews, is, as well in consonants as in vowels and other points, and in matter as well as in words, divinely inspired; and by it all versions, eastern or western, are to be examined, and where they vary, are to be conformed to it."¹

Such opinions were not confined to Switzerland, and of them we now reap the fruits. Being trained on such ideas, there are many devout minds which receive a severe shock if it be suggested that Moses may not have been the author of the Pentateuch; that Genesis bears evidence of being a compilation from various independent documents; that other books of the Old Testament are of a composite character; that the prophecies of Isaiah and Zechariah are not the work of one author throughout; that the whole of the Old Testament may have been brought into its present form in the days of Ezra, or even later, and that in the course of many transcriptions some errors of the scribes may have found their way into the text.

In our days criticism has pronounced these and similar judgements, and many of them are receiving constant confirmation. And they are seized upon by some, who have no love for revelation, and are glad of any means to disquiet the minds of the faithful, and are put forward in crude and exaggerated forms as helps toward undermining the

See Formula Consensus Helvetica (Canon ii.), Niemeyer, p. 731.

authority of the sacred Scriptures. Devout criticism, and it abounds, has no such aim; and those who have given most earnest labour to these investigations feel more than others for the pain which godly people may suffer from the unwarranted representations which are sometimes made concerning the results of critical inquiry into the origin of the Old Testament. Hence they wax more earnest in their work, assured that the light will spread, and that a better understanding of what is, and what is not, at stake in these investigations will sooner or later dispel this alarm.

For it was not always thus. Devout men in former times accepted a great part of what is put forward by modern critics, and found the authority of the Bible in nowise impaired thereby. None will accuse Calvin of undervaluing the Scriptures, yet nowhere can one find more of what is now called "free handling" than in his commentaries. Examples, both in our own country and abroad, could easily be multiplied. One will serve the purpose. Dr. Whitaker, who was Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge from 1580 to 1596, and who was largely engaged in controversy with the Romanists on the authority of the Scriptures, writes: "It is very possible that the books [of the Old Testament], which may have been previously in some disorder, were corrected by Ezra, restored to their proper places, and disposed according to some fixed plan, as Hilary, in his prologue, affirms particularly of the Psalms."¹

The over-great superstition with respect to the sacred text had not arisen in the days of Calvin and Whitaker, and there was more widely diffused than at present a knowledge of its history. This enabled men to keep firm hold upon that which constitutes the true value of the Scriptures, to distinguish between the Divine purpose of revelation and the fallible human agency which God has employed for its

¹ See Whitaker's *Disputation on Scripture*, p. 116. (Parker Society.)

publication. It is with this latter that criticism of words and language deals, and clear knowledge on this point is all that is needed to allay any anxieties which are now raised by discussions concerning text and authorship.

The Old Testament bears witness unto Christ. He Himself has told us so. And His apostles teach us that it is able to make men wise unto salvation; that it is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness. To serve these objects it was given, and we cannot possibly turn to better authority than our Lord and His apostles for the way in which it may be employed to do so. They constantly appeal to the writings of the older covenant, but from the way they do this we have clear evidence that textual criticism would have given them no alarm; that their concern was not with the verbal exactness of the vehicle, not with niceties of text or with unity of authorship, but with that instruction which is in righteousness and which is conveyed to men in the sacred record.

The New Testament, written in Greek, represents our Lord and His apostles as employing, not the Hebrew Scriptures, but a Greek version of them, the Septuagint, which had been made at various times between the close of the Hebrew canon and the first or second century before Christ. The Greek version, though giving the general sense of the Hebrew fairly well, is by no means an exact translation; yet in it Jesus found that testimony and those lessons after which He earnestly exhorted men to seek as the way to life eternal.

One or two examples will make plain both what has been said about the character of the Septuagint version, and also show the way in which our Lord and His apostles made use of it. And first of Christ Himself. In St. Matthew xxi. 16 we find Him replying to the murmurings of the chief priests and scribes, who were offended at the hosannas

of the attendant children. Jesus says, "Have ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings *Thou hast perfected praise?*" Here He is quoting from the Septuagint of Psalm viii. 2. But that passage in the Hebrew, which is strictly represented by our English translations, ends with "*Thou hast ordained* [R.V., established] *strength.*" And this rendering is in entire harmony with the context of the psalm, which speaks of stilling the enemy and the avenger. For such a work *strength* and not *praise* would be needed. It in no way concerns us to inquire how the Septuagint rendering of this verse arose. It suffices that Jesus has accepted it as giving the spirit of David's psalm. He had enemies around Him of a different character from those contemplated by the psalmist. But the Divine economy is manifested in many ways, and it is part of that economy to use the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and it is suitably represented, whether the faithful lips of children be described as a bulwark against the folly of the adversaries, or their youthful praises as a confusion to the malice of opposing priests and scribes.

The same psalm supplies us with an example of the way in which, out of a somewhat inexact rendering in the Septuagint, the writers of the New Testament were able to derive needful lessons of Divine truth, and made no scruple about verbal preciseness. The psalmist is speaking of the dignity which God bestowed upon man at the creation. "Thou hast made him but little *lower than God*, and crownest him with glory and honour; Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands, Thou hast put all things under his feet." In the Septuagint, the first clause of this passage is rendered, "Thou hast made him a little *lower than the angels.*" And this translation was accepted, and made the basis of an argument, by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and in consequence of

that acceptance, the translators of the Authorized Version followed in the psalm the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew. The Revised Version has given the correct translation, and has made the passage refer, as it was meant to do, to the creation of the first Adam in God's image and after God's likeness.

Yet see how the apostles accept the rendering of the Seventy, and draw from it true instruction! St. Paul's lesson is found in 1 Corinthians xv. 27, where he uses the psalm as witness that in the first Adam there was a promise of the second. He quotes the words, "God hath put all things under his feet," and refers them not to Adam, but to Jesus Christ.

The other apostle (Heb. ii. 3-9), if indeed it be not St. Paul here also, is comparing the word that was of old time spoken by angels with that gospel which began from Christ and was continued by His disciples. The latter, he shows, was incomparably the grander message. The angels proclaimed the law, but since the incarnation men have been made fellow workers with the Lord of glory in publishing the message which speaks of life and immortality. This is the honour which God has bestowed upon man in the second Adam. By humiliated human nature, after its assumption by Christ, God has now manifested His glory, as it had never been manifested among, or by, the angels. The psalmist had celebrated the subjection of all nature to the first Adam. The apostle testifies that a greater exaltation than this shall be realized. To Christ, our Lord, the Son of man, in a far higher sense, all things shall be made subject. We see not indeed as yet all things put under Him. All the exaltation of which man is made capable through the incarnation has not yet been made manifest. But a foretaste of it there has been. We see Jesus the God-Man, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.

In this way the comparison with the angels serves the apostle's purpose. The words of the psalm could most fitly be applied to Him, the Son of man, who was also the Son of God; and His humiliation was followed by an exaltation, which is a pledge of the future crowning of those whom He has not been ashamed to call His brethren, though now they may here be suffering, as He did that He might be made a perfect Mediator.

It may have been a feeling of reverence which led the Septuagint translators to render by "angels" the word which is properly the name of God Himself. For the representatives and ministers of God are sometimes, in the Old Testament, called by this name *Elohim*. Thus the judges are so designated in Exodus xxi. 6, xxii. 8, where however the Revised Version has placed "God" in the text, and "the judges" on the margin. But satisfied with the version of the Seventy as conveying the Spirit of God's teaching, the apostles adopt it and expound it, to the great comfort of multitudes of godly souls in the generations that have come after them. And we may rest assured that those who did so would have paid little regard to the sort of questions which verbal criticism must raise, and which are of importance in their degree, but mainly for tracing out the various stages of the history of the sacred text.

The next example is different in character, and even more striking. In the council which (Acts xv.) was held at Jerusalem, about the terms of admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Church, we find St. James, after he has alluded to St. Peter's visit to Cornelius, whereby the door of the Church was opened to the Gentile world, continuing his remarks thus: "To this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written:

After this I will return,

And I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen;

And I will build again the ruins thereof;

And I will set it up :

That the residue of men may seek after the Lord,

And all the Gentiles, upon whom My name is called,

Saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from the beginning
of the world."

The quotation is made by St. James from the Septuagint translation of Amos ix. 11, 12. But instead of "that the residue of men may seek after the Lord," the Hebrew has, "that they (*i.e.* Israel) may possess the remnant of Edom." Now it is almost certain that the Seventy took the word אֶדוֹם=Edom, as if it were אָדָם=man. Thus "the remnant of Edom" would at once become "the residue of men." They must also have regarded this as the subject, and not the object, in the sentence, and read the verb יִרְשׁוּ="they may inherit," or "possess," as if it were יִדְרְשׁוּ="they may seek." Thus the change of the rendering in the Septuagint may be in some degree explained. But over this verbal change the apostle stumbles not. He feels that the later expression includes the earlier, that when the residue of men and all the Gentiles seek the Lord, the faith of Israel will have prevailed among the remnant of Edom. For the purpose of his argument he can, without demur, accept the language of the version; for in it is contained the same, yea, even fuller, testimony to the Divine scheme of salvation. The true up-building of the house of David shall be the up-building of all mankind beside.

Almost every book of the New Testament yields a supply of similar examples. Those which have been given are enough to show that, though the Septuagint varies from the Hebrew, now in its way of expressing the precise form of thought, now by a changed rendering of single words, and at times in the larger difference of a whole modified sentence, the speakers and writers in the New Testament did not regard this as a bar to its use, but accepted it as

expressing the substance of God's revealed word, and found in it what they knew the Old Testament writings were intended to teach.

Nor was it that they were ignorant of the existence of such difference from the original as we have been noting. When it is necessary, they can leave the Septuagint, and render the Hebrew closely for themselves. Perhaps one of the most interesting instances in proof of this is found in St. John xix. 37: "They shall look on Him whom they have pierced." In this quotation from Zechariah xii. 10, the Septuagint renders, "They have danced over in triumph," instead of "they have pierced." They appear to have read דקדק=to dance, instead of דקדק=to wound; but the evangelist gives the correct translation of the Hebrew.

Similarly in 1 Corinthians iii. 19, St. Paul leaves the Septuagint, to which in most cases he adheres faithfully. He is quoting from Job v. 13, "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness," and his words are, ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν. Instead of this, the Septuagint has ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ φρονήσει. Everywhere else but in this passage the Seventy translate ערמה by πανουργία; and the apostle takes that word as the true sense here also, while for the verb he employs δράσσομαι, which they never use for this Hebrew word.

Instances of this kind are not numerous, for, as has been already said, the New Testament writers, as a rule, follow the Septuagint, but they are enough to show us that this following did not come about because these writers were unable to go to the original for themselves, if they found it best to do so; and their practice makes it quite manifest, that what they sought and found in the writings of the older covenant was something with which verbal and literal criticism does not and cannot interfere.

We may gather also that they would have been undisturbed by questions such as are now discussed concerning

the diversity of authorship in any books of the Old Testament. To them the whole volume was one, and all its parts of co-ordinate authority. Hence St. Matthew (chap. xii.), writing about our Lord's reproof to the Pharisees on the observance of the Sabbath, represents Jesus as citing from 1 Samuel the example of David, and immediately afterwards quoting the book of Numbers in support of His position, and completing His rebuke by pointing out the true principle of religious observance as set forth by Hosea, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." Each quotation is put forward as of equal authority, and as part of one and the same Divine revelation. To Christ it signified not whether for His purpose God has made use of three writers or one. In the same way, and in the same chapter, Jesus couples together the books of Jonah and of the Kings, in His witness against the evil generation who would see a sign. The men of Nineveh and the queen of the south shall each rise up in the judgment and condemn them.

And our Lord's manner in thus using the Old Testament is illustrated amply in¹ the other synoptists. St. John does not record many details of Christ's conversations with other persons than His disciples, and to them He does not quote the Old Testament Scriptures. But where the evangelist himself has occasion to make use of Old Testament illustration, we find his practice exactly the same. The whole volume is but one Divine record. Thus, in chapter xii., he quotes from Zechariah, and twice over

¹ Modern investigation concerning the text of the New Testament supplies us with an interesting example in Mark i. 2. The *textus receptus* was correctly rendered in the A.V. "As it is written in the prophets." The quotations which follow are from Malachi and from Isaiah. But, as is now established, the earliest and best supported text would be rendered (as in R.V.) "As it is written in Isaiah the prophet." The evangelist, though citing Malachi first, speaks of the whole as "written in Isaiah." So entirely of one piece to his mind was the whole cycle of the Old Testament prophecy. Some later hand, finding two different prophets quoted, noted the fact, most probably on his margin, and in time the marginal note was substituted for the primitive text.

from Isaiah, as if they were all of one authority ; while in chapter xix. he places side by side extracts from the Psalms, from Exodus, and from Zechariah : thus employing, in one single chapter, words from each part of the Old Testament as divided by the Jews, from the law, the prophets, and the Psalms.

The same use is found in St. Paul's epistles, and in other epistles also. He discusses, in chapters ix.-xi. of the Epistle to the Romans, the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles ; and in the midst of an argument where almost every sentence contains some allusion to the Old Testament records, the apostle quotes directly from Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, several times over from the Psalms and from Isaiah, and from Nahum ; and he uses the language of these various writers as though it were all of co-ordinate value and importance, all alike bearing evidence to the same revealed truth.

In the same way St. James in one chapter (ii.) employs for his argument the words of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Job, and treats them all as of the same cogency.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, as might be expected, quotations from the Old Testament are very numerous. Quite two-thirds of the books are either directly quoted or indirectly alluded to. Yet there is not a trace that one portion of the volume was of more esteem than another for that instruction in righteousness for which the whole was given.

We may be well assured, then, that our Lord and His apostles would have heard without concern the conclusions at which modern criticism has arrived, or is likely to arrive, concerning the mixed authorship of any or of all the Old Testament books. Familiar with the Septuagint, as we see they were, they must have known the tradition, which is recorded in 2 Esdras xiv., of Ezra's prayer that he might

receive the Holy Spirit in such measure as to enable him to rewrite the law which had been lost, and how tradition said the prayer was granted. They must have been acquainted with the more matter of fact statement made in 2 Maccabees ii. 13-15 about the gathering by Nehemiah of the acts of the kings, and the prophets, and of David, and about a similar collection made in later days by Judas Maccabæus. In times when such traditions were current, no such worship of the letter of the Old Testament could have prevailed as would check the use of reason and observation upon the documents as they stood, nor would there have been any hesitation in admitting that these sacred books had undergone some important revision in the days which succeeded the captivity. But the faithful in those times believed that the same Divine Spirit was guiding Ezra, Nehemiah, and Haggai which had guided Moses and Joshua and David: and so believing they were at peace in their minds, assured that the truths of revelation had been ever preserved, though the channels which conveyed had been changed; assured that it was as ever the word of Him who testifies, "I am Jehovah, I change not." And like assurance would come, nay, will come, now of clearer knowledge. It is but the long silence on such topics which makes men think them perilous to be discussed; whereas in truth the discussions, now happily growing to be more widely appreciated, deal only with the external presentment, with the casket in which God's truth is contained, seeking to find any indication of how the various pieces thereof were brought to form a part of the admirable work. From such a study reverently conducted we cannot but be gainers in the end, cannot but grow in admiration of the Wisdom which has preserved for the world this knowledge which by its own wisdom the world had never found.

In connexion with this absence¹ of concern about pre-

¹ It may be noted as an instance of disregard of verbal precision, though in

ciseness of text in the New Testament writers, there is another feature which deserves to be noted. Not only do the apostles quote from the Septuagint where it varies from the Hebrew, but they also not unfrequently allow themselves to make some alteration, to give some slight turn to the Greek which shall make it more completely suit their argument. Thus in 1 Corinthians iii., St. Paul is speaking against the wisdom of this world as being foolishness with God, and he continues, "For it is written, The Lord knoweth the thoughts *of the wise* that they are vain." The Old Testament passage to which he refers is Psalm xciv. 11. But there the words are, "The Lord knoweth the thoughts *of men* that they are vain." The original verse has reference to the whole human race, but the apostle does not hesitate to modify it, that it may the better fit into his argument. The modification impairs no whit the truth of what is said. If God has given sentence on all men's hearts, the hearts of the wise are included in the verdict. St. Paul's limited application does not exclude the wider truth of the psalm.

Once more, in Ephesians iv. 8, the apostle, speaking of the gifts which Christ since His ascension has bestowed through the Spirit, quotes thus: "Wherefore he saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, *and gave gifts unto men.*" In the psalm (lxviii. 18) the last phrase of this passage is, "*Thou hast received gifts for* (R.V., among) *men.*" The language there is a description of the glorious ascent of the ark into Mount Zion, and in prophetic vision the psalmist sees, and tells, how the long train of Jehovah's willing captives shall come thither to follow the ark, for God's might shall prevail and win submission among all men. The apostle applies the words to

quite another kind, that while all the four evangelists give an account of the inscription above Christ's cross, the words, in the original, are slightly different in each gospel (cf. Matt. xxvii. 37, Mark xv. 26, Luke xxiii. 38, John xix. 19). Had the gospels been merely a work of man's device, this discordance would have been removed.

Christ. He has ascended into heaven, of which Zion was but a poor figure. He has led and is leading His conquered ones into His blessed bondage. At this point St. Paul turns aside to illustrate some previous words, in which he had been speaking of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and knowing that what Christ has won (according to the psalmist's words) among men by His incarnation, He has won only to shed back upon men again in blessed showers, he is bold to modify the psalmist's expression, while retaining its substance and force; and so he says of Christ *that He gave gifts* unto men.

Of this kind these examples will suffice. They also show us that the New Testament writers were not careful about verbal preciseness, if only they could convey the full force of what they felt to be the true lessons of the older covenant. Niceties of language which come properly under the notice of the students of the sacred text would have seemed of little importance to St. Paul or St. James. They are of interest, but their interest is historic, not doctrinal. And there has never before been a time when an examination of such questions could be thoroughly undertaken. The opportunities and studies of the present time all tend to direct inquiry toward such points. The wider and more constant intercourse among nations, the discovery of new MSS., the comparison of texts, must raise questionings. But "search the Scriptures,"¹ was meant for this phase of inquiry also, and zealous labour in this newly opened field will yield good fruit. The ultimate result of searching may be to make men modify some opinions which they have long entertained about the structure and history of the

¹ For our argument it does not matter whether the verb in this verse (John v. 39) be taken as imperative or indicative. The Scriptures testify of Christ, and a rebuke of the devotion to a study of the book rather than of the life which it contains (which would be the force of the indicative) does not make less important or less needful the rightly directed search to find out Christ in His revelation.

Old Testament books. But if there be no good grounds for holding them, if they have grown up from want of light, if different opinions can be supported by trustworthy evidence, then it is well that, though hallowed by age, mistakes should be cleared out of the way. If we will but show our faith in Christ by obeying His command, He who bade us search will send us light, and make ever clearer His own saying, which is what gives their value to the Old Testament records, that they bear witness unto Him.

J. RAWSON LUMBY.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

IX. CHRIST NOT A SELF-ELECTED, BUT A GOD-APPOINTED PRIEST (CHAP. V. 1-10).

AT length the priesthood of Christ, already three times alluded to, is taken up in earnest, and made the subject of an elaborate discussion, extending from this point to chapter x. 18. The writer begins at the beginning, setting forth first of all that Christ is a legitimate priest, not a usurper: one solemnly called to the office by God, not self-elected. For this is the leading thought in this introductory statement. It seems indeed to be only one of two. *Prima facie* one gets the impression that the writer's object is to specify, as of equal and co-ordinate importance, two fundamental qualifications for the office of a high priest, and then to show that these were both possessed in a signal manner by Jesus. Every perfectly qualified high priest, he appears to say, must both sympathise with men, and have a call from God: accordingly Jesus had such a call, and was also eminently sympathetic. And he evidently does regard sympathy as, not less than a Divine call, indispensable, the terms in which he speaks of it being quite remarkable for emphasis and vividness. Nevertheless he does not put the

two on the same footing. The chief thing in his mind here is the call or appointment; the sympathy is referred to, in connexion with its source, personal infirmity, as explaining the need for a call, so as to suggest the question, Who, conscious of the infirmity which is the secret of sacerdotal mildness, would dream of undertaking such an office without a Divine call? Hence in the application of the general principles enunciated regarding the high-priestly office (vers. 1-4) to the case of Christ (vers. 5-10) no reference is made to His sympathy, but only to His call, and to experiences in His earthly life which showed how far He was from arrogating to Himself the priestly office. These experiences were indeed a discipline in sympathy, but that aspect is not spoken of.

If sympathy is not co-ordinate with the call in the writer's mind, still less is it his main theme. Yet it is apt to be regarded as such by those who assume that the Hebrew Christians were familiar with the doctrine of Christ's priesthood, and stood in no need of its being *proved* to them, or even elaborately expounded, but only of its being *used* for their encouragement under trial. To such chapter v. 1-10 will naturally appear a pendant to the statement in the close of last chapter concerning the sympathy of Christ as the great High Priest, containing some such line of thought as this: Compassion may be counted on in every high priest, for he is conscious of his own infirmity, and moreover he is called to office by God, who knows whom to call, and takes care to call only such as are humane in spirit. On both grounds you may rest assured of the sympathy of Jesus.¹ As I understand the passage, its drift is rather this: Sympathy is congruous to the high-priestly office in general. It arises out of the sense of personal infirmity; whence also it comes that no right-minded man would undertake the office except as

¹ So Professor Davidson.

called of God. Jesus assuredly undertook the office only as called of God. He was called to the priesthood before His incarnation. He came to the world under a Divine call. And during the days of His earthly life His behaviour was such as utterly to exclude the idea of His being a usurper of sacerdotal honours. All through His incarnate experiences, and especially in those of the closing scene, He was simply submitting to God's will that He should be a priest. And when He returned to heaven He was saluted High Priest in recognition of His loyalty. Thus from first to last He was emphatically One called of God. Thus viewed, the passage before us is obviously the proper logical commencement of a discourse on the priesthood of Christ, intended to instruct readers who had next to no idea of the doctrine, and needed to be taught the very rudiments thereof. Was this their position, or was it not? It is a question on which it is very necessary to make up our minds, as the view we take of it must seriously influence our interpretation of the lengthy section of the epistle of which the passage now under consideration forms the introduction.¹

What is said of the sympathy that becomes a high priest, though subordinate to the statement concerning his call, is important and interesting. First, a description is given of the office which in every clause suggests the reflection, How congruous sympathy to the sacerdotal character! The high priest is described as taken *from among* men, and the suggestion is that, being a man of like nature with those for whom he transacts, he may be expected to have fellow-feeling with them. Then he is further described as ordained

¹ The views of recent expositors on this important subject are widely divergent. Thus Mr. Rendall in *THE EXPOSITOR* for January, 1889, p. 32, says that the Hebrew Christians "did not connect the idea of priesthood with Christ, though they knew Him as their Prophet and their King." Professor Davidson, on the other hand, says, "The fact that the Son is a High Priest is a commonplace to his readers" (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 106). I have expressed my own view, to the same effect as Mr. Rendall, in the introductory paper in *THE EXPOSITOR* for March, 1888.

for men in things pertaining to God, the implied thought being that he cannot acquit himself satisfactorily in that capacity unless he sympathise with those whom he represents before God. Lastly, it is declared to be his special duty to offer sacrifices of various sorts *for sin*, the latent idea being that it is impossible for any one to perform that duty with any earnestness or efficiency, who has not genuine compassion for the sinful.

What is implied in ver. 1. is plainly stated in ver. 2, though in participial form, in accordance with the subordinate position assigned to the requirement of sympathy in relation to the Divine call. "Being able to have compassion on the ignorant and erring."

Very remarkable is the word employed to describe priestly compassion, *μετριοπαθεῖν*. It does not, like *συμπαθεῖν* in iv. 15, signify to feel with another, but rather to abstain from feeling *against* him; to be able to restrain antipathy. It was used by Philo to describe Abraham's sober grief on the loss of Sarah and Jacob's patience under affliction. Here it seems to be employed to denote a state of feeling towards the ignorant and erring balanced between severity and undue leniency. It is carefully selected to represent the spirit which becomes a high priest as a mean between two extremes. On the one hand, he should be able to control the passions provoked by error and ignorance, anger, impatience, disgust, contempt. On the other hand, he must not be so amiable as not even to be tempted to give way to these passions. Ignorance and misconduct he must not regard with unruffled equanimity. It is plainly implied that it is possible to be too sympathetic, and so to become the slave or tool of men's ignorance or prejudices, and even partaker of their sins; a possibility illustrated by the histories of Aaron and of Eli, two high priests of Israel. The model high priest is not like either. He hates ignorance and sin, but he pities the ignorant and sinful. He is

free alike from the inhuman severity of the pharisee, who thinks he has done his duty towards all misconduct when he has expressed himself in terms of unmeasured condemnation regarding it, and from the selfish apathy of the world, which simply does not trouble itself about the failings of the weak. He feels resentment, but it is in moderation; disgust, but it is under control; impatience, but not such as finds vent in ebullitions of temper, but such rather as takes the form of determined effort to remove evils with which it cannot live on friendly terms. All this of course implies a loving, kind heart. The negative virtue of patience implies the positive virtue of sympathy. The model high priest is one in whose heart the law of charity reigns, and who regards the people for whom he acts in holy things as his children. The ignorant for him are persons to be taught, the erring sheep to be brought back to the fold. He remembers that sin is not only an evil thing in God's sight, but also a bitter thing for the offender; realizes the misery of an accusing conscience, the shame and fear which are the ghostly shadows of guilt. All this is hinted at in the word *μετριπαθεῖν*, whereby at a single stroke the writer *photographs* the character of the model high priest.

The character thus drawn is obviously congenial to the priestly office. The priest's duty is to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin. The performance of this duty habituates the priestly mind to a certain way of viewing sin: as an offence deserving punishment, yet pardonable on the presentation of the appropriate offering. The priest's relation to the offender is also such as demands a sympathetic spirit. He is not a legislator, enacting laws with rigid penalties attached. Neither is he a judge, but rather an advocate pleading for his client at the bar. Neither is he a prophet, giving utterances in vehement language to the Divine displeasure against transgression, but rather an intercessor imploring mercy, appeasing anger, striving to awaken Divine pity.

But the special source to which sacerdotal sympathy is traced is the consciousness of personal infirmity. "For that he himself also is compassed with infirmity." The explanation seems to labour under the defect of too great generality. A high priest is no more human in his nature and experience than other men, why then should he be exceptionally humane? Two reasons suggest themselves.

The high priest was *officially* a very holy person, begirt on all sides with the emblems of holiness, copiously anointed with oil, whose exquisite aroma typified the odour of sanctity, arrayed in gorgeous robes, significant of the beauty of holiness, required to be so devoted to his sacred calling and so dead to the world that he might not mourn for the death of his nearest kin. How oppressive the burden of this official sanctity must have been to a thoughtful, humble man, conscious of personal infirmity, and knowing himself to be of like passions and sinful tendencies with his fellow worshippers! How the very sanctity of his office would force on the attention of one who was not a mere puppet priest the contrast between his official and his personal character, as a subject of solemn reflection. And what would the result of such reflection be but a deepened self-knowledge, a sense of unworthiness for his sacred vocation, which would seek relief in cherishing a meek and humble spirit, and in manifesting a gracious sympathy towards his brethren, considering himself as one also tempted; and would gladly hail the return of that solemn season—the great day of atonement—when the high priest of Israel offered a propitiatory sacrifice *first* for his own sins, and then for the people's.

Another source of priestly benignity was, I imagine, habitual converse in the discharge of duty with the erring and the ignorant. The high priest had officially much to do with men, and that not with picked samples, but with men in the mass; the greater number probably being

inferior specimens of humanity, and all presenting to his view their weak side. He learned in the discharge of his functions to take a kindly interest in all sorts of people, even the most erratic, and to bear with inconsistency even in the best. The poet or philosopher, conversant chiefly with ideal men, heroes invested with all imaginary excellences, is prone to feel disgust towards real common men, sadly unheroic and unromantic in character. The high priest had abundant opportunities for learning that the characters even of the good and devout are very defective, and he was thankful to find that their hearts were right with God, and that when they erred they were desirous to confess their error and make atonement. He looked not for sinless, perfect beings, but at most only for men broken-hearted for their sins, and bringing their trespass offering to the altar of the Lord.

The account given of priestly sympathy prepares us for appreciating the statement which follows concerning the need for a Divine call to the priestly office. "And no one taketh the honour to himself, but only when called by God, as indeed was Aaron" (ver. 4).

No one, duly impressed with his own infirmities, would ever think of taking unto himself so sacred an office. A need for a Divine call is felt by all devout men in connexion with all sacred offices involving a ministry on men's behalf in things pertaining to God. The tendency is to shrink from such offices, rather than to covet and ambitiously appropriate them. The sentiment, *nolo episcopari*, which has ever been common in the best days of the Church, is not an affectation of modesty, but the expression of a deep reluctance to undertake the onerous responsibilities of a representative man in religion by all who know themselves, and who realize the momentous nature of religious interests. The sentiment is deepened by the reflection that the office is honourable as well as sacred. For it is a

maxim which calls forth a response from every healthy conscience, that men should not seek honours, but be sought for them, it being but an application of the proverb, "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth."

Having stated the general principle that a Divine call is necessary as an inducement to the assumption of the priestly office, the writer passes to the case of Jesus Christ, whom he emphatically declares to have been utterly free from the spirit of ambition, and to have been made a high priest, not by self-election, but by Divine appointment. Of the two texts quoted in proof of the assertion, the second, taken from Psalm cx., naturally appears the more important, as containing an express reference to Messiah's priesthood. This oracle, the key to the whole doctrine of the epistle on the subject in question, is introduced here for the first time, very quietly, as if by the way, and in subordination to the more familiar text already quoted from the second Psalm bearing on Messiah's sonship. Here once more we have occasion to admire the oratorical tact of the writer, who, having in mind to present to his readers a difficult thought, first puts it forth in a stealthy, tentative way, as if hoping that it may thus catch the attention better than if more obtrusively presented; just as one can see a star in the evening twilight more distinctly by looking a little to one side of it, than by gazing directly at it.

It is difficult to understand, at first, why the text from the second Psalm, "My Son art Thou," is introduced here at all, the thing to be proved being, not that Messiah was made by God a Son, but that He was made a Priest. But on reflection we perceive that it is a preliminary hint as to what sort of priesthood is signified by the order of Melchisedec, a first attempt to insinuate into the minds of readers the idea of a priesthood belonging to Christ altogether distinct in character from the Levitical, yet the highest possible, that of one at once a Divine Son and a Divine

King. On further consideration it dawns on us that a still deeper truth is meant to be taught; that Christ's priesthood is co-æval with His sonship and inherent in it. Only when we find this idea in it do we feel the relevancy of the first citation to be fully justified. So interpreted it contains a reference to an *eternal* Divine call to the priesthood, in consonance with the order of Melchisedec, which is described farther on as "having neither beginning of days nor end of life"—eternal *à parte ante*, as well as *à parte post*. Thus viewed, Christ's priestly vocation ceases to be a mere accident in His history, and becomes an essential characteristic of His position as Son: sonship, Christhood, priestliness, inseparably interwoven.

From the pre-incarnate state, to which the quotations from the Psalter refer, the writer proceeds to speak of Christ's earthly history: "Who, in the days of His flesh." He here conceives, as in a later part of the epistle He expressly represents¹ the Christ as coming into the world under a Divine call to be a Priest, and conscious of His vocation. He represents Christ as under training for the priesthood, but training implies previous destination; as an obedient learner, but obedience implies consciousness of His calling. In the verses which follow (7, 8) his purpose is to exhibit the behaviour of Jesus during His life on earth in such a light that the idea of usurpation shall appear an absurdity. The general import is: "Jesus ever loyal, but never ambitious; so far from arrogating, rather shrinking from priestly office, at most simply submitting to God's will, and enabled to do that by special grace in answer to prayer." It is implied that this is a true account of Christ's whole behaviour on earth; but the special features of the picture are taken from the prelude to the passion, the agony in the garden, where the truth of the representation becomes startlingly conspicuous.

¹ Chapter x. 5.

In the description of the tragic experiences of that crisis, we note the pains taken to lay bare the *infirmity* of Jesus, the object being to show the extreme improbability of one who so behaved assuming the priestly office without a Divine call. The familiar fact that Jesus prayed that the cup might pass from Him is stated in the strongest terms: "When He had offered prayers and supplications with strong crying"; and a particular is mentioned not otherwise known, that the prayers were accompanied with "tears." Jesus is thus made to appear manifesting, confessing His weakness, frankly and unreservedly; even as the high priest of Israel confessed his weakness when he offered a sacrifice for himself before he presented an offering for the people. Whether the writer had in his view a parallel between Christ's agony in the garden and the high priest's offering for himself it is impossible to decide, although several things give plausibility to the suggestion, such as the use of the sacrificial term *προσενέγκας* in reference to Christ's prayer in the garden.¹ What is certain is that he is careful to point out that Christ was compassed with infirmity not less real, though sinless, than that which in the case of the Jewish high priest made it necessary that he should offer a sacrifice for himself before offering for the people; the moral being, how unlikely that one who so shrank from the cup of death should be the usurper of an office which involved the drinking of that cup!

The hearing of Christ's prayer referred to in the last clause of ver. 7 belongs to the description of His sinless infirmity. Whether we render, "And being heard for His piety," or "and being heard (and delivered) from the fear" (of death as distinct from death itself), is immaterial;² in

¹ Hoffmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 399, earnestly contends that such a parallel is intended. Vide *The Humiliation of Christ*, p. 277, where I have stated and adopted his view. I still feel its attraction, but I am not so sure that the alleged parallel was present to the writer's mind.

² Opinion is very much divided as between these two renderings of the words

any case the answer consisted in deliverance from that fear, in courage given to face death. Some have supposed that the reference is to the resurrection and ascension. But it is not permissible to read into the passage a hidden allusion to events of such importance. Moreover the reference is excluded by the consideration that all that is spoken of in ver. 7 leads up to the main affirmation in ver. 8, and must be included under the category of learning obedience. The last clause of ver. 7 describes the attitude of one who shrank from death, and who was at length enabled to face death by special aid in answer to prayer delivering him from fear; that is to say, of one who in all that related to the passion was only learning obedience. The point to be emphasised is, not so much that the prayer of Jesus was heard, as that it needed to be heard; that He needed heavenly aid to drink the appointed cup.

To perform, or even to attempt, such a task without a conscious Divine call was impossible. Even with a clear consciousness of such a call it was difficult. That is the truth stated in ver. 8, in these terms: "Though He was a Son, yet learned He obedience from the things which He suffered." Freely paraphrased these words mean: In His earthly experience Christ was so far from playing the part of one who was taking to Himself the honour of the priesthood, that He was simply throughout submitting to God's purpose to make Him a Priest; and the circumstances were such as made obedience to the Divine will anything but easy, rather a painful process of learning. Reference is made to Christ's sonship to enhance the impression of difficulty. Though He was a son full of love and devotion to His Father, intensely, enthusiastically loyal to the Divine

εἰσακουθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, many weighty names being on either side. Bleek supports the first view, Bengel the second. On the whole, the weight of authority and of argument inclines to the rendering, "being heard for His piety, or His godly fear."

interest, ever accounting it His meat and drink to do His Father's will, yet even for Him so minded it was a matter of arduous learning to comply with the Father's will in *connexion with His priestly vocation*. For it must be understood that the obedience here spoken of has that specific reference. The aim is not to state didactically that in His earthly life Jesus was a learner in the virtue of obedience all round, but especially to predicate of Him learning obedience in connexion with His priestly calling—obedience to God's will that He should be a Priest.

But why should obedience be so difficult in this connexion? The full answer comes later on, but it is hinted at even here. It is because priesthood involves for the Priest death (ver. 7), mortal suffering (ver. 8); because the Priest is at the same time victim. And it is in the light of this fact that we clearly see how impossible it was that the spirit of ambition should come into play with reference to the priestly office in the case of Christ. Self-glorification was excluded by the nature of the service. One might be tempted to take unto himself the honour of the Aaronic priesthood, though even with reference to it one who fully realized its responsibilities would be disposed to exclaim, "*Nolo pontifex fieri.*" A vain, thoughtless, or ambitious man might covet the office of Aaron, because of the honour and power which it conferred. In point of fact, there were many ambitious high priests in Israel's last, degenerate days, as there have been many ambitious ecclesiastics. But there was no risk of a self-seeker coveting the priestly office of Christ, because in that office the Priest had, not only to offer, but Himself to be the sacrifice. With reference to such a priesthood, a self-seeker would be sure to say, "I do not wish it; I have no taste for such an honour." Yea, even one who was no self-seeker might say, "If it be possible, let me escape the dread vocation"; and he would accept its responsibilities only after a sore struggle

with the reluctance of sentient nature, such as martyrs have experienced before appearing with serene countenance at the stake. The holy, sinless Jesus did indeed say "no" for a moment in reference to this unique sort of priesthood. His agony in Gethsemane, so touchingly alluded to in our epistle, was an emphatic "no," which proved that, far from proudly aspiring, He found it hard even to humbly submit to be made a priest.¹

The verses which follow (9, 10) show the other side of the picture: how He who glorified not Himself to be made a priest was glorified by God; became a priest indeed, efficient in the highest degree, acknowledged as such by His Father, whose will He had loyally obeyed. "And being perfected became to all who obey Him author of eternal salvation, saluted by God 'High Priest after the order of Melchisedec.'" A weighty, pregnant sentence, setting forth the result of Christ's earthly experience in terms suitable to the initial stage of the discussion concerning His priestly office, implying much that is not expressly stated, and suggesting questions that are not answered, and therefore liable to diverse interpretation.

"Being perfected," how? In obedience, and by obedience even unto death, perfected for the office of priest, death being the final stage in His training, through which He became a *Pontifex consummatus*. Some think the reference is to the resurrection and ascension. So, *e.g.*, Pfeiderer, who thus argues: "*τελειωθείς* is not the moral perfecting in the learning of obedience through suffering, but a new moment, the last result of that learning, through which Christ was placed in a position to become the cause

¹ Referring to the agony in the garden, I have said in *The Humiliation of Christ*, "That agony was an awfully earnest, utterly sincere, while perfectly sinless, *nolo Pontifex fieri*, on the part of One who realized the tremendous responsibilities of the post to which He was summoned, and who was unable for the moment to find any comfort in the thought of its honours and prospective joys" (p. 276).

of blessedness. What that condition is we gather partly from the connexion, partly from ver. 7. There it is said that Christ prayed to His Father to save Him from death, and was heard for His piety. This piety is then described in ver. 8; whereupon ver. 9, with *τελειωθείς* takes up the *εἰσακουσθείς* of ver. 7, and so says that He was saved from death, which of course in this case is to be referred to the exaltation following on the resurrection."¹ It is a plausible and tempting line of thought, but I cannot help feeling that the writer of our epistle has studiously avoided such specific references, and expressed himself in general terms fitted to convey the moral truths involved independently of time and place. I therefore see no reason for assigning to *τελειωθείς* a different meaning from that which seemed to be the most appropriate in chapter ii. 10.

Being made perfect in and through death, Jesus became *ipso facto* author of eternal salvation, the final experience of suffering, by which His training for the priestly office was completed, being at the same time His great priestly achievement. Such I take to be the writer's meaning. This interpretation implies that in his view the death of Christ was a priestly act, not merely a preparation for a priesthood to be exercised afterwards, in heaven. Nay, not merely a priestly act, but the great priestly act, the fact-basis of the whole doctrine of Christ's priesthood. I have no doubt that such is the case. It is noteworthy, in this connexion, that the first and the last times the writer refers to the subject of Christ's priestly work, chapter ii. 9 and chapter x. 10, it is to His death that he gives prominence: "that He should taste death for every man";

¹ *Paulinismus*, p. 344. Pfeleiderer finds a reference to the heavenly state in all the texts which speak of the perfecting of Christ. He holds moreover that where the word is used in reference to men, it includes in its meaning the idea of glorification, combining the Pauline *δικαιοῦν* with the Pauline *δοξάζειν*; the combination illustrating the characteristic ambiguity of the epistle in regarding the Christian salvation as at once a present and a future good.

“we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ.” That Christ’s priestly ministry is placed in the heavenly sanctuary is not less certain, and the two views seem to be in flat contradiction to each other. Whether they can be reconciled and how are questions which may come up for discussion hereafter ; meantime let us be content to leave the two views side by side, an unresolved antinomy, not seeking escape from difficulty by denying either.

The statement that through death Jesus became *ipso facto* author of salvation is not falsified by the fact that the essential point in a sacrifice was its presentation before God in the sanctuary, which in the Levitical system took place subsequently to the slaughtering of the victim, when the priest took the blood within the tabernacle and sprinkled it on the altar of incense or on the mercy-seat. The death of our High Priest is to be conceived of as including all the steps of the sacrificial process within itself. Lapse of time or change of place is not necessary to the accomplishment of the work. The death of the victim, the presentation of the sacrificial blood—all was performed when Christ cried *Τετέλεσται*.¹

It is not the writer’s object in this place to indicate the nature of “salvation,”—that is, the precise benefit procured for men by Christ as Priest,—but simply to indicate the fact that He attained to the high honour of being the source or author of salvation. Two facts however he notifies respecting the salvation of which Christ is the author: that it is *eternal*, and that it is available for those who *obey* Him. The epithet *αἰώνιος*, here used for the first time, frequently recurs in the sequel. It is one of the great, characteristic

¹ Some theologians, such as Professor Smeaton, contend for an entrance “within the veil” by Christ, with His blood, in His disembodied state, immediately after His death on the cross. The feeling which dictates this view is right, but the view itself takes too literally and prosaically the parallel between Christ and the Jewish high priest. For Professor Smeaton’s view vide *The Apostles’ Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 48.

watchwords of the epistle, intended to proclaim the absolute final nature of Christianity, in contrast to the transient nature of the Levitical religion. Possibly it is meant here to suggest a contrast between the *eternal* salvation procured by Christ and the *annual* salvation effected by the ceremonial of the great day of atonement. More probably its introduction at this place is due to the desire to make the salvation correspond in character to the Melchisedec type of priesthood, whose leading feature is perpetuity: "Thou art a Priest for ever." To the same sense of congruity it is due that obedience to Christ is accentuated as the condition of salvation. Christ became a Saviour through obedience to the will of His Father, and it is meet that He in turn should be obeyed by those who are to receive the benefit of His arduous service. It is a thought kindred to that expressed by Christ Himself when He spake of the Son of man laying down His life for the many as the way He took to become the greatest, and to be ministered unto by willing subjects.

The Divine acknowledgment of Christ's priestly dignity, referred to in ver. 10, is not to be prosaically interpreted as a formal appointment; whether a first appointment, as some think, to an official position now commencing in the state of exaltation, or a second confirming a first made long before, alluded to in the Messianic oracle quoted in ver. 6 from Psalm cx.¹ It is rather the animated recognition of an already existing fact. Christ, called from of

¹ Mr. Rendall takes this view. He says: "The language of this verse and the context alike point to a new appointment quite distinct from that recorded in the Psalms, though both refer to the same Melchisedec priesthood. Psalm cx. has been cited as evidence of the earlier appointment of God's Anointed by prophetic anticipation to a priesthood. This verse declares the formal recognition of His *high* priesthood by a Divine salutation addressed personally to Jesus" (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 45). I agree with him so far as to recognise the distinction between the two appointments, only I cannot regard the expression "*formal* recognition" as true to the spirit of the passage commented on.

old to be a priest in virtue of His sonship, and made a priest indeed by His arduous training on earth, is cordially owned to be a priest when the death which completed His training, and constituted Him a priest, had been endured—whether immediately after the passion or after the ascension must be left undetermined. The style is dramatic, and the language emotional. God is moved by the spectacle of His Son's self-sacrifice, as of old He had been moved by the readiness of Abraham to sacrifice Isaac, and exclaims, "Thou art a Priest indeed!" That the writer is not thinking of a formal appointment, which creates a position previously non-existent, appears from the liberties he takes with the words of the oracle which contains the evidence that Christ was a God-called Priest: "high priest" substituted for "priest," and "for ever" omitted. The former of these changes is specially noteworthy. It is not accidental and trivial, but intended and significant. The alteration is made to suit the situation: Christ, already a High Priest in virtue of functions analogous to those of Aaron, and now and henceforth a priest after the order of Melchisedec. The oracle, as adjusted, combines the past with the future, the earthly with the heavenly, the temporal with the eternal.

Translated into abstract language, ver. 10 supplies the *rationale* of the fact stated in verse 9. Its effect is to tell us that Christ became author of eternal salvation because He was a true High Priest after the order of Melchisedec: author of *salvation* in virtue of His being a priest, author of *eternal* salvation, because His priesthood was of the Melchisedec type—never ending.

The words put into the mouth of God serve yet another purpose: to indicate the lines along which the writer intends to develop the subject of Christ's priesthood. His plan is to employ two types of priesthood to exhibit the nature of the perfect priesthood of the absolute final religion—the order of Aaron, and the order of Melchisedec.

I say not that he means to teach that Christ occupied successively two priestly offices, one like that of Aaron, the other like that of Melchisedec, the former on earth, the latter in heaven. That is too crude a view of the matter. His plan rather is to utilize the Aaronic priesthood to set forth the nature of Christ's priestly functions, and the Melchisedec priesthood to set forth their ideal worth and eternal validity; and he here as it were lets us into the secret. The plan in both its parts is based on Scripture warrant, to be produced at the proper place. This view of the writer's method is not to be summarily set aside by the assertions that priest and high priest are synonymous terms, and that the functions of all orders of priesthood are the same. As to the one point, it is enough to say that the writer uses the two words with discrimination: "priest" when likening Christ to Melchisedec, "high priest" when comparing Him with Aaron. As to the other, it is to be remarked that no mention is made of sacrificial functions in connexion with Melchisedec's history as given in Genesis, and that the writer evidently does not choose to ascribe to him functions not spoken of in the record. Arguing from his way of drawing inferences from the silences of history, one might rather conclude that because he found no sacrificial functions mentioned in the story, he therefore assumed that such duties as were performed by Aaron about the tabernacle did not enter into the idea of the Melchisedec priesthood.

The words, "high priest after the order of Melchisedec," containing the programme of the discussion about to be entered on, we expect to find the two topics suggested taken up in this order: first, Christ as High Priest; next, Christ as Priest after the order of Melchisedec. In point of fact, they are taken up in the inverse order. Why, we may be able to discover in a future paper.

A. B. BRUCE.

*THE BREAD PROBLEM OF THE WORLD,
OUR LORD'S FIRST TEMPTATION.*

CHRIST comes to the baptism, finding in that ritual the expression of thoughts with which He is labouring. These thoughts, emphasized by the ritual, find their antitheses in the temptation. A ritual nourishes the roots of the thoughts it expresses. He is on the banks of the Jordan in a human society which shades down from John to the basest of men. Whatever men may be, the law of humanity remains, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." To be human, in the ideal of humanity, is all righteousness. Christ, in baptism, accepts this humanity.

After the ritual, our Lord hurries into a wild, weird, lone waste, carrying a flood of great thoughts, to inspect the elements of the situation. The creation of a spiritual humanity of a superior order is the gravity upon His mind. He is with Himself in this wilderness, engaged upon the plan of His own being and the specifications of the architecture before Him. He who creates must have a plan. He chooses His methods, and finds definitions for Himself. He looks to His destination, and settles Himself into its terms and limits. The temptations, what we call the temptations, are surveys of the situation; and from them came the battle of alternatives, competitions of methods, divergences from the predestined ideals, which lend themselves as oppositions in the scheme of things.

In this collision of procedure He encounters the Bread Problem of the world. The problem of food lies in the very core of humanity, inheres in its very structure. In the earliest look we give to our being, as we front the adventure of it, we find that our food is big in the schedule. He who wishes to teach men how to live, he who would prescribe methods of life, he who would be a regenerator of

faculty and feeling, must adjust himself to this question. Christ had a Bread Problem for Himself and us to solve. It will be my aim to argue that the Food Problem, which is the physical basis of man, suggests to our Lord certain modifications of the Divine programme He holds.

Three introductory explanations are necessary before we can reach the heart of our subject, to clear the ground of the argument, and they apply to the three temptations.

First, that these temptations must be strictly regarded as visions and debates of the mind. The arena on which the battle of alternatives and competitions is fought is the spirit. It is possible for the devil to carry Christ on his shoulders, and actually place him on one of the spikes or finials of the Temple towers, though to many minds it must appear a clumsy procedure for the sublime purpose of a temptation. But it is not possible for the devil to place Christ on any mountain in Palestine or elsewhere where He could literally see the kingdoms of the world. To see with the eye the kingdoms of the world means seeing Babylon, Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Rome; the legions of Rome in their military accoutrement, and flush of victory; the commerce of Corinth carried in its ships and stored in its warehouses; the philosophy of Athens in the manuscripts of Euripides and Plato; the literature of the classic age in the library of Alexandria. This is a sheer visual impossibility. The spectacle of the kingdoms is mental. If the literal and physical break down in the third temptation, they fail equally with the first and second. The temptations are thoughts, looks of the mind, inspections of the situation, repulsions and attractions in the scheme of life appointed to Him. A temptation is a superior plan of action struggling with the inferior, the will with its determinations facing the Divine predestinations.

The subjectivity of the temptations is further confirmed

by the order preserved in Luke's narrative. He makes Matthew's third temptation to be the second. Canon Farrar in his classic *Life of Christ*, adopting the traditional view that the first temptation was addressed to the hunger of Christ, and the second to a fall from a giddy height, very properly adds, "both orders cannot be right," and then makes an apology for inspiration. But both orders are right, if the temptations are in the realm of the subjective. The thoughts crossed and recrossed each other, occurred and recurred, and the record is simply a classified summary of forty days' reflections and examinations. Any order now becomes right.

A *second* explanation respects the nature of the literature before us, which is poetic. The historians got their report of the thought of the forty days from Christ Himself, and He is the Master of parables. A diary of forty days' intense studies and rapt surveys, of the mental absorption which had suspended the functions of the body, cannot be compressed in ten lines of print. The journal is turned into a poem; the report is partly dramatic, partly epic in form, a kind of literature not known in the modern world, and belongs to the genius of the Hebrew nation. In the first chapter of Genesis we have the history of tens of thousands of years, the chemistry and physiology, the flora and fauna, the geology and biology, of millenniums of time condensed into one page. Here we have wide ranges of visions extracted into ten lines. This manner of literature is only possible to the poetic faculty, and probably to the Shemitic species of poetry. We see the artist, who can make a picture of leagues of cloud and miles of mountain by the mixture of a few colours, by a few strokes of the brush, on a canvas a foot square. The poet can idealize the infinite in a few similitudes. The register of these forty days is the painting of an artist with a creative mind. The literature is not historical writing; it is not a chronicle. It is

history sublimed, facts idealized, details generalized, and a poem got. It sums up as on painted canvas, on statued marble, in statuesque, the history of an unique situation. Poetry is often superior to history, always nearest to the human understanding.

The three temptations are a poem, in which the Divine theory of Christ's situation is pictured, in which human life appears in its laws, limitations, first principles, inner meanings. There is a glow and thrill in the story which only poetry could import into it. It is curious to note that Milton's *Paradise Regained* is wholly these temptations in a modern epic garb, as if the poet's genius had perceived that Christ's entire mission was mirrored in them.

Third. The literal history is made altogether improbable, and the exclusive mental sphere of the temptations made certain, by the fact reported by Mark and Luke, that the temptations were distributed over the whole of the forty days, and are not concentrated into three intense activities at the end of them, which last is the reading uniformly given by interpreters. It is said, "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, being forty days tempted of the devil." This diffusion of the temptations requires that we separate the hunger of Christ from the incitement to turn stones into bread. It requires us to take the first two verses of Matthew's and Luke's narrative as the historical introduction not to the first temptation only, but to all three. We confuse history with poetry, and the historic introduction with the ideal story, when we connect the hunger with the first temptation. The order in which the temptations are given depends upon the standpoint of the narrator. The Bread Problem was probably first in time, occurring however again during the forty days. The World Temptation is however the first in order of rank, recurring also all through the forty days. Luke may as well have

put Matthew's third as first, as he has Matthew's third as second.

Our Lord's hunger has no more to do with the first temptation than with the second. We must separate with an accentuated clearness the hunger at the end of the forty days from the proposal to convert stones into bread. Our Lord became hungry after the temptations were past. When the ecstasy of thought, the mental abstraction is over, the temptations are over. When the tension of thought and temptation is past, the body remembers itself, and recovers its suspended functions. When Moses is engrossed giving a constitution to Israel, he neither eats nor drinks. When Christ is thinking out a constitution for the kingdom of the soul, He neither eats nor drinks. The hunger comes when distinctions are got and decisions taken, and the victory is obtained. The conversion of stones into bread was not the trial of a hungry man. The hunger is felt after the abstraction and thought subside, and the temptations belong to the period of abstraction, and depart with it. The hunger is outside the temptation.

The temptations are prefaced by three facts: the locality of the wilderness, the mental entrancement of forty days, the hunger which follows the cessation of the entrancement. There history ends. Then the details of the temptations are reported as idealities, pictured in the form of proposals to convert stones into bread, to take a leap down from the finial of the Temple tower, to accept the offer of the kingdoms of the world. The poetic form of the literature, the thought-sphere of the temptation, the separation of the hunger from the proposal to convert stones into bread, reveal the grandeur of the occasion. If the trial consisted in the pang of hunger, and this as an introductory taste of hardship and a suggested dislike to a mission involving pain, it is poor enough. But the address is made to the deepest that is in Christ, to the philanthropy of His soul

and the pain of philanthropy, and to His mission as the Creator of a new quality of the human soul. It is not mere endurance, physical and moral, that is tested here, but it is a vision of the structure of human nature which is given to Christ, and the problem is handed to Him to develop a new quality in it. This is not an address to the luxurious use of power, nor is it intended to rouse a disappointment with His situation because He was hungry. Every temptation is a revelation, and this is a revelation of the forces needed to make men Christian. The temptation to convert stones into bread is a temptation to the use of inferior forces, which will be short and transient methods with human nature. It is a modification of the original plan in the interests of philanthropy. It is a subtle seduction.

The natural basis of this subtle seduction is the Bread Problem of our world, and its relations both to the comfort of men and to the spiritualities which Christ has come to introduce. Our Lord has just come from the artisan life in Nazareth. Nazareth is a town notorious for its poverty and ill conditions of human nature. In village huts He had seen and felt how hard it is for men to make their daily bread, and what bread is made is mostly coarse, scanty, hard fare, unworthy of us. The normal condition is one of bare subsistence; chronic poverty is man's outward estate. The comfortable classes make a limited upper ten thousand. The masses and the millions live on the edge of famine, with just enough to pay rent and taxes, make ends meet, and life passable. We begin at the point of nothing, and continue to the end apprentices to labour, clerks to industry, and masters only of want. The harvest of the year is always trembling in an uncertain balance; sunshine and rain seem to be badly proportioned, frost and heat are untimely, we look ever with anxiety to the autumn fates. This universal, abnormal destitution of the human

race engages the earliest thought of Him who accepts the position of its chief and Redeemer. How want pressed on every side of us, what a hand to mouth struggle it was, and without dignity, how the earth refuses to give us more than dry crusts,—these facts, these humiliations, are a vision to the Head of the race who is considering His plans for the spiritual republic. He naturally encounters on the threshold this primeval, cleaving circumstance, environing human nature as a curse, and apparently degrading it.

To reduce the pressure of this controlling force, to make the terms of natural existence easier, to call up a new history of humanity by removing this Bread Problem, to get this relief as the dominant feature of His work, is the insidious thought which receives the drapery and dramatic force of the words, "Command that these stones be made bread."

The instigation to this thought is in the possession of power. "If Thou art the Son of God, and in the consciousness of power by Thy recent baptism, as solar worlds and planetary conjunctions, light and heat, are at Thy bidding, grow heavier harvests, make Thyself monarch of plenty, make men comfortable, save them by first mitigating their hard outward lot. An acre produces twenty-eight bushels of wheat, cause it to produce one hundred bushels, and the lot is mended, and they will be set free to more elevating occupations." The income per head in Britain is £30, in France £20, in Turkey £4, in India £2. Men are underfed, underclothed, underhoused. Raise this income to £300 a year, and the human conditions will be dignified and sweetened. This is the idea which the allegory of the temptation literature expresses. Wheat is a grass, a wild grass specialized by cultivation. The discovery of another wild grass, capable of an edible variation, hardy, enduring opposite climates of heat and cold, dampness and dryness, holding a heavier head of grain, richer in gluten and starch,

which is within the capabilities of our wild grasses, would materially alter the condition of man's life on earth. This gift of comfort will be a fine foundation on which to rest the spiritualities of the kingdoms. This new enactment by Him who is the Lawgiver of the race would be the best inauguration of the new society to be established. This is a plausible method of procedure, and the devil of a modified programme which appeals to Him.

The address is made to the best in Christ, to the sympathy of the heart. Who that has thought to any purpose, and who carries a feeling in the soul for his race, has not felt the sharpest pang of being that so many of his kind, with noblest possibilities, are badly housed, coarsely fed, rudely dressed? Who that has seen the beauty of the human face, of man and maiden in their prime, and loves a human face by innate attractions within him, and thinks of the poverty, the incapacity, the want of opportunity which are the lot of men, has not felt that the plan of being is too severe, and soothed his pain with the indispensable future which is to compensate humanity for its present suppressions? Patience alone quiets our pain, and in impatience we wait. "Command that these stones be made bread," is the summary of a wish for a swift, short, but unsafe expedient for the elevation of the race. It is philanthropy in a hurry.

The pathos of the soul, the movement of families, the migration of races, the fortunes of nations, and the history of the world, have been inspired by the price of bread.

One of the earliest records of a human sigh expresses the hope of relief from the unending strife of finding bread. In the traditions of the Shemitic race, Lamech is known to have said on the birth of a child, "This same shall comfort us concerning the . . . toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." Hebrew nationality has its sources in a famine. The family of Jacob go to Egypt in a dearth of food, and find Joseph superintending a

dearth-oppressed nation. There they remain, and abandon those nomadic habits indigenous to the Shemite, and a national cohesion begins. There the family becomes the nation, and develops its own peculiar genius of religion under the stimulating influences of the wisdom of Egypt. Their last education into nationality was in the want of the wilderness, which left traces in them which were never lost, and to which they turn as unforgotten history. Ruth falls into the royal line of David in the progress of a famine. The Greeks and the Hindüs started from the uplands of the Caucasus in search of new lands, when their own native highlands could no longer support the growing population. The fortunes of East and West took colour from the bread migrations of this vigorous Aryan race. That the Greek and Sanscrit languages are varieties of the same language once spoken by the same race is one of the central discoveries of our day.

Plato is writing philosophy when he says, "The body is a source of endless trouble to us by reason of the mere requirement of food."¹ Tacitus says that Augustus Cæsar was able to turn Rome into an imperial state by supplying cheap corn to its starving multitudes.² That vilest of men and most wicked of princes, the Emperor Nero, who was a punishment to his age, had a hold on the affections of Rome by keeping granaries of corn ever ready to feed its population. In the century of our Lord, Jerusalem had suffered much from scarcities. The messianic hope became corn romances, which pictured the Messiah as standing on the shores of Joppa, the Mediterranean wafting pearls at His feet, and He distributing bread to the people, and want and toil becoming memories of the past. The only occasion when the popular enthusiasm ran so high on the side of Christ that the people would have made Him a king, was

¹ Jowett's *Plato*, "Phædo," vol. i., p. 439.

² *Annals*, book i. 2.

after He had fed the five thousand. There is a Gaelic proverb which says, "Hunger is a violent companion"; and its violences are determining impulses, which direct the careers of men, of tribes, of nations.

Modern history has large epochs inspired by this bread impulse. A German philosopher has wittily and pathetically said, "Luther shook all Germany to its foundations, but Francis Drake pacified it again; he gave us the potato."¹ The deeper hunger which Luther stirred demanded a higher mode of living, and the potato supplied the richer starch which the body needed to be parallel with the spirit, justified by faith. To this day the potato continues its reign. In France the dry summer of 1788 was followed by a winter below the freezing point. 1789 was a famine unmanageable by Church and State. Barley bread, soaked bran, mouldy rye, were the food of the people. On July 14th the Bastille fell, which has changed the face of Europe to this day. Had Louis XVI., like Nero, kept granaries to feed the people, Europe had never seen a Napoleon. That Revolution, the product of hunger, originated ideas of franchises which still rule Europe. "Fancy, then, some Five full grown Millions of such gaunt figures, with their haggard faces (*figures hâves*); in woollen jupes, with copper-studded leather girths, and high sabots, starting up to ask, as in forest-roarings, their washed Upper Classes, after long unreviewed centuries, virtually this question: How have ye treated us; how taught us, fed us, led us, while we toiled for you? The answer can be read in flames, on the nightly summer-sky: . . . EMPTINESS,—of pocket, of stomach, of head and of heart. Behold there is *nothing in us*; nothing but what Nature gives her wild children of the desert: Ferocity and Appetite; Strength grounded on Hunger. Did ye mark among your Rights of

Man, that man was not to die of starvation, while there was bread reaped by him? It is among the Mightys of Man.”¹

We are the wealthiest country in Europe. In 1847, within living memory, half a million of men perished in the Irish famine by the failure of Drake's potato and Heine's specific. Thousands died with the spade in the hand; the dying were not fed; the dead were not buried. The whole social system of Ireland depended upon the potato. Two millions emigrated to America, to give a Celtic human floor to the new world as the old world had the same, making perhaps the greatest human exodus known in modern history. It was in the struggle of the corn laws that Cobden and Bright received the ingrained conviction that we should not be a happy nation till our representative institutions were perfected, an idea which has influenced the course of politics ever since, and its issues will colour our history to the very end. During the last ten years we have heard the howl of hunger in Ireland, and seen the madness of it; and in Scotland the crofter cry for more bread and better bread is making a patient people rebellious. In thirty years famines have carried off twelve millions of people in India and cost the Government twenty millions of money.

In the forefront of the speech which Mr. Parnell delivered on receiving the great Irish testimonial to his services is his sympathy with human want, which was his power and his opportunity.

“I looked round, and saw artisans in the towns struggling for a precarious existence with a torpid trade and with everything against them. I saw also the tenant farmer trembling before the eye of the landlord, with the knowledge that in that landlord's power rested the whole future of himself and his family; that his position was literally no better, physically not so good, as the lot of the South African negro; . . . that his life was a constant struggle to keep a roof over

¹ Carlyle, *French Revolution*, vol. i., book vi., “General Overturn,” p. 179.

his head and over the heads of his family, . . . I saw the Irish labourer, the lowest of the low, the slave of the slave, with not even a dry roof over his head, with the rain from heaven dropping on the couch on which he was forced to lie, dressed in rags, subsisting on the meanest food. . . . Here was a nation carrying on its life, striving for existence, striving for nationhood, under such difficulties as had never beset any other people on the face of the globe."—*Times*, Dec. 12th, 1883.

A Regenerator, a Redeemer, a Power, who is going to make history, must take this economic problem as an important factor in His calculations. When our Lord retired for thought, we find our Lord doing just what we should have expected Him to do: to begin His inspection of human laws and forces where man's life begins, and to adjust Himself to the external, natural, and physical life of man, as it stands related to the inner, psychic, and spiritual life. The sensuousness of man has always to be reckoned with in treating him. The sensuousness has to be respected and harmonized. Merely to live is the first prize of our being; and yet to keep ourselves alive, to keep this prize, is a grim effort all our days. The heavy price we pay for this prize is the struggle to keep ourselves living, and there is even a pleasure in the struggle; it is so central to live. We will not resign life, spite of the fierce battle. Suicide is the last insanity of our nature.

This line of thought gives a natural basis to that conference with Himself which Christ holds in the wilderness, out of which comes the tempting wish, which calls the power of divinity to its aid. The poor shall never cease out of the land. The struggle for bread is always to be there. By this economic law spiritual eminences will be obtained, nourished in the soil of want and carrying a moral chemistry from it, and the higher kingdoms will be found. "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

I shall verify the conclusion at which we have arrived by the equations we obtain from it to our own situation.

1. In the refusal to be a corn-grower and the discoverer of a cereal of a richer potency, Christ reveals the ground-plan of our being. "Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." This is quoted from an ancient document. It is history that God is the basis of human nature, religion the archæan gneiss and fundamental floor, in which all the stratifications of human thought and activity are deposited. Man lives by revelations of God and commandments of God. The primitive and primary element in man is his sense of God, and his responsiveness to far off connexions, and to the tide of the infinite playing on his faculties. The mind ingredient in the protoplasm of us distances us from nature, though we are a constituent part of it; and the nature of mind is seen in its opening correspondences with God. He who would redeem man or renovate him, He who would elevate the type of him, and initiate an epoch in his history, must make this structure the stress of his central thoughts. Religion gives to man his centralness, and to give him a new direction or development you must touch the vital centralness.

This sense of God, this divineness, becomes conspicuous in the thoughts of these days. Abraham began his career in the youthful antiquity of our world by a new conception of God and a new sensitiveness to Him. The cohesion of the Hebrew nationality was got from a finer responsiveness which Moses has found and which is expressed by the name Jehovah. The epoch of modern history takes its mark from Christ. The last turn which Europe took, and on the lines of which it is still moving, was obtained through Luther and a religious revolution. Grote has said of Greece, "Grecian antiquity cannot be at all understood except in connexion with Grecian religion."¹ Gibbon has said of Rome, "The innumerable deities and rites of polytheism

¹ *History of Greece*, vol. i., p. 400. Library edition.

were closely interwoven with every circumstance of public and private life.”¹ Renouf says of the ancient Egyptians, “Religion in some form or other was dominant in every relation of their lives.”²

Religion as the uniform expression of man's deepest thought, and as a continuous factor in history, ever present, I must pronounce as the marvel of our world. We are so familiar with it, that the marvel is lost upon us. Our Lord explains the portentous phenomenon which Gibbon and Grote and Renouf have registered, by the principle that man's structure is such that he must be a Divine feeder. The nutriment indexes the nature, and the nature the nutriment. His constitution requires Divine revelations; he can live only by the natural operation of his faculties upon God, in congenialities and correspondences. There is a hunger in him which no harvest by sea or land can still. He looks upward to God. He sees God; he worships a Father; he sacrifices to Powers that rule him from above. To keep right with the august Being that invests him round is the high struggle which shows his high quality, and to inspire him in this struggle is the main business of redemption; all other things shall be added to this. Primitive man, when the world was young, saw a shell on the seashore, felt its pearly lustre and its spiral lines and flutings; perhaps putting it to his ear, he heard the roar of the sea in the imprisoned vibrations within its chambers, like the phonograph that keeps the sound that once was started in it: and he startles with a vision of the infinite Hand that carved those lines and set those colours. In the dreams which love reflected in its contest with death, the dreamer saw his lost friend in other fields and other shores, and a vision of the Otherwhere haunts him and becomes a guidance. In the purple line of the hills against the blue

¹ *Decline and Fall*, vol ii., p. 48. Bohn's edition.

² *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 26.

sky, in the cuttlefish and in the palm tree, he sees a beauty and a majesty in which is revealed the Power which is felt in his consciousness as over him, and of relations outside of this world, of situations that begin where lands and oceans end. Homer says, "All men everywhere open wide their mouth for the gods, as the fledgling does for food." Before the Greek Attic and its cousin the Hindu Sanscrit were spoken, when that Aryan language was spoken of which Greek and Sanscrit began as dialects, a future life was sung in hymns. In the hymns of the Vedas, which Professor Max Müller has unearthed and deciphered for us, the freshness of the early dawn was the picture which pictured the boundless One, the infinite God. Before the era of Moses, in a temple in Egypt sacred to Isis stood the inscription, "I am all that was and is and shall be, nor my veil has it been withdrawn by mortals." In the 139th Psalm, which is a Hebrew lyric of man's structure, the emotion is got from the marvel that man is ever in the presence of an Invisible Spirit. "Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising, Thou understandest my thought afar off. Whither shall I go from Thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?" He is overpowered with this occult investment, and becomes lyrical, "I will praise Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made." It is this historic fact and psychologic structure with which Christ meets the kindly feeling to make men comfortable in outward circumstances. It is written in an old book, and is the conclusion of history and psychology, "Man doth not live by bread alone, but by the word of the mouth of God." It will not touch his central need to make him more comfortable. It may injure that centralness. His work must begin at another point.

In the anatomy of this temptation, in the earliest thoughts that occupy the Redeemer of men, we see laid bare the constitution of our being, its regnant forces, and

the methods of the Divine government over us. To know God, to be in response to Him, to answer His will by a corresponding conduct, this alone finds the seats and centres of us. This is the word of God, the manifestations, by which he lives. We touch our summits when we want God. We see the redemption we need when these are the summits to which we have to be raised. The religious idea is a ruling force; the religious sentiment guides and has guided the eventful career of man. To provide a finer medium for the visions of this idea, to make more forceful this sentiment, is the primal want of this world of ours. And here Christ sees the stress of His work must be laid.

2. The commandment or word which Christ receives and obeys is to restrain His benevolence and let the natural law of poverty alone and to introduce other laws. The stress or sting of the temptation is in the words, "If Thou be the Son of God"—as and since Thou art the Son of God. The consciousness of power and of a good intention is in the higher and more subtle kinds of temptation. Is it necessary to keep within the old lines, to let misery alone and to continue the former history, when other methods are at hand and history might proceed on other lines? Is it necessary that He should hold in abeyance the power He possesses and withhold Himself? Very few men can have power and waive its use. He has the power to convert stones into bread, to be the King of plenty; He has the power to redeem men from the struggle with want. But He and His work are under limitations; His divinity works by law, and His love includes law; and law restrains the freedom of love and divinity.

The work of Christ is within the old laws and the structure of human nature. It is not miraculous. He continues nature, and He carries the religions of nature with Him. He inserts no new elements into nature; the supernatural is, after all, a prolongation of the lines of the natural. Christ

is to work on the basis of nature, and the moral revolution which He is to effect will proceed on the lines of nature as it has been from the beginning. Christ is to work along with the struggle for bread, and the Bread Problem to remain where it ever was, even though the new worker be the Son of God. Man has always lived in God when he has followed the higher impulse, and not fallen back upon the animal, and Christ has come to give a fine and fresh potency to this life in God and to create a new type of it. The Christian life is not obtained by a miracle. It is the most natural thing for us. It is a higher nature to us; its germs are innate in us. Be true to your constitution, and you will develop into a Christian. The Spirit of Christ is where truth is; He leads into all truth. The Christian life is the finer life of God in us, which is our natural life.

There is a certain independence gifted to our freewill, but our freewill has to suppress and subordinate it. Mind is a miracle in the midst of matter, which is a mere mechanism. We are at liberty, and yet we are bounded; and the will finds its freedom in recognising the suppression and the limitation. The reason for our limitations is that we gain a future and more permanent good by refusing the temporary good. From our secular limitations come spiritual enlargements. Keep within the routines and traditions of your country, and then conventionalisms break up and you become original. Christ keeps within the rules of humanity, and very soon He does the most original work ever done in our world, which was foolishness to the Greek and an offence to the Jew; and He has created the highest races by the originality of the crucifixion. Begin with the creeds, and then you will not want creeds. You will leave the road of the creeds and roam over the hills and valleys of the Bible. Keep within the limitations appointed to you, and then limits dissolve away, and the Unlimited will guide you. Time is on the side

of every man who surrenders himself to law and limit, who prefers future good to immediate advantage, who postpones the showy for the solid, and waits. "If thou be so and so, do this; as thou hast so and so, go there," are siren notes, and we must rule even a legitimate power and restrain even a benevolent liberty.

There are no straight lines in nature, except in crystal forms. Look at a coast-line, at a mountain-line, at the clouds, at the rocks. The lines curve in and out, wind up and down. The curve is the line of beauty. Rules take us in straight lines, bounded on each side; and as you keep straight the rules go out of sight and you get into the curves of love. Law is lost in love; but there is a stage at which love and law are quarrelsome, and there is temptation in that stage. Limitation purchases for us the illimitable. Love is impatient with law.

3. The unmended struggle for bread is to be continued by the Founder of the new society as a spiritual agency. Christ leaves alone the struggle for bread, leaves it just where it has always been, and, as always, it will be utilized for moral purposes. We are not to be made comfortable outwardly; with the sweat of our brow and brain we are to earn our living. In this effort, in this medium, we shall hear more correct reports of the soul, and learn the more intimate decrees of Heaven. Christ refuses to mitigate the harsh conditions of being, but He will furnish lights by which we shall get more heart for the battle appointed to us. To be is a privilege; and we get the privilege of being, on the sovereign condition that we work out of the lower into the higher. There is a lower and there is a higher; and the law of ascension is that we crucify the lower; and the crucifixion of Jesus is a new leverage for this lift. If the religion of Christ had made us more easy than we were before, it would lose half its value. It rather reveals a pain deep in the heart of the universe

by His crucifixion. If a religion were introduced which brought comfort to men as one of its great factors, we should become religious for the sake of the comfort, and we should become rich, comfortable saints, which means a pauper population of religious men at best ; but worse, we are likely to become a society of hypocrites, becoming Christians for the sake of the comfort. The blessing of ease is refused in this temptation to the race of men and the religion of Jesus. The blessing of rest is to be given ; and rest is the equilibrium of struggling forces. Ease is the negation of force and the decomposition of structure.

The appointment is continued, unmodified, that we begin life at the point of nothing, with a bare body, and to keep life by labour ; to find the living for life by signing articles of industry. Labour may pass a point and become struggle, and struggle may pass a point and become agony. Labour, struggle, agony, are the lines on which we are moving, and in this campaign there will be Sabbath armistices, when we will hear the higher word of God and get deeper insights of the mystery which encompasses us round. Being is made dear to us in both senses of the word. It is dear, and we will not part with it, and the price we pay for keeping it is dear. The young man who refuses to take the bit in his mouth and yoke to labour finds a freedom to waste himself and decompose at leisure. America and Australia are new continents made by the youth of the overcrowded old continents from compulsions of bread. We have to follow right loyally the directions which these compulsions impose upon us.

The margin is always the narrowest between bread and famine, and one of the early temptations which emerges for us all is to chafe with the difficulties, to take it easy or overstep the limitations. To hear the rumble of discontent, to be irritated with the conditions, to revolt from them ; and it makes the sad breakdown of a heavy percentage

of human souls. Two temptations will emerge : to do as little as possible, or to do too much in the haste to be rich. Ambition, on the one hand, and indolence, on the other, pride or ease, will shape themselves into temptations. These temptations manfully overcome by a righteous labour will bring a sense of God, a vividness of conscience, and a vision of principles. We are potential with good, and the struggle to begin right will bring out the best. Life is a battle of alternatives ; and the left-hand alternative, met by the loyalist that is in us, will summon the finer powers into government, and illuminate the fields around us, and give us our right hand. The irrigation of human nature is got through religious ideas ; and we shall get them as we see the plan of God, that man lives by bread from heaven.

When life is a story of poverty or of mere competence, when we prefer labour to a counterfeit comfort, when we eat the bread of sorrow according to the will of God, then we see that the lines of this world are produced to another. We discern an essence in duty and drudgery for functions elsewhere. The junction of time and timelessness is seen, and the heat of the junction felt. The anomaly between our proud faculties and penurious surroundings grates on us, and the friction flashes on us the central, commanding, immortal structure of our being. If we had all that we want for the body, we should feel that we were spent and finished here—and there is nothing more for us. Discontent with the outward discovers the finer contents of our being. Herodotus says that the gods envy men their happiness,¹ and we now know the reason, that holiness may be emphasized as the master-idea of being. Christ leaves unmitigated this struggle for bread, leaves the law of harvests where it has ever been, and uses the scanty food-supply as an instrument for the spiritualities of His kingdom. “Labour not for the meat which perisheth”

¹ Book vii. 46.

has been accented as never before. The discourse on the heavenly bread is Christ's exposition of this temptation.

4. The special element which Christ supplies for redemptive purposes becomes visible. That element is the crucifixion. In this temptation the Cross is before Him. The bread He has to furnish is His dead body. It is divinity and death that are mingled in His great work. By divinity alone He can supply the famine of the world. He feels this power, and the feeling gives force to the temptation, "If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." But it is divinity and death that are the true bread, which are the true need of man. This truth, accented by the temptation, is the basis of the great sacrament. "Take, eat; this is My body, broken for you. My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed." In the foreground revelations of this hour is the Cross. Temptations are revelations.

When our Lord was approaching the realities of the crucifixion, and the shadow became a pain, His mind reverts to the baptism in which the shadow also was. The crucifixion is the fulfilment of it. In the baptism, the mission of death was first made vivid. "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" The stress of the crucifixion was felt in the visions of the water sacrament, and hence the point of the figure and the prefiguration. The temptations were holding Him from the prophetic pain, trying to soften the forecast of it by suggesting possible methods which would avoid or postpone it.

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all other things shall be added." Christ emphasized this order for Himself and for us, that we are to begin at this beginning. We are to begin with the soul when we begin this life. When God is King of the soul, and Christ is Lord of the heart; when we are living by the best and truest in us; when we

have found the primary affections, and our feet are on the original basements of things—then we are in the kingdom of God. Every idea of happiness without holiness, every thought of success without obedience, every scheme for bettering ourselves without bettering our inward nature, is a fatuousness. And this is the beginning: "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me; for whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

Christ furnishes for us the forces of the crucifixion, and the crucifixion is the law of the beginning. We speak in science of a magnetic field. Place a magnet on a table, and cover the table with iron filings. The filings will arrange themselves round the magnet with greater or less intense-ness. The nearest will stick to it, the farther will turn sharply towards it, and the farthest will feel that there is a force near to command them. Within a certain radius they will group themselves in relation to the attractions of the magnet. The magnetic condition of the soul is got by the poles of the crucifixion; and when that is got the externals of life will be under government. Circumstance will be in rough or kindly attendance. "All other things shall be added." Christ makes bare the basement of us, by His crucifixion, when in our name He says, "Man doth not live by bread alone." Bread is circumstance after all.

5. The message to the Church from this vanquished temptation is, that her radical work is missions, not charities. She first builds churches, then schools and hospitals. She says no word about literature and science, because these are involved in the larger. Her message is religion, not civilization; grace, not culture; salvation, not charities. Civilization comes by getting that which is fairer and better than civilization. The Greeks cultivated philosophy:

ceasing to be philosophers, in the later decay, they became great merchants. The Hebrews cultivated righteousness: ceasing to be prophets, they ended by becoming great financiers. Greek and Hebrew dropped on the lower platform, through which they had unconsciously passed on their way to the higher. Phœnician traders were once the honourable of the earth; but they began with the lower, and perfected themselves in it. They found the lowermost. Their mere memory is with us, but they have left not a scrap of literature nor an inspiring character for the good of the race. The Greeks have bequeathed a philosophy, and the Hebrews the Old Testament.

The unsafe value we attach to the lower is illuminated by this temptation, and is a beacon to us. The substance of a man is the Worship in him. The deeps of our manhood are not opened till we receive and obey Divine revelations. Christ shows us the substance by His death. Take a good grasp of the governing law, that the more we make of this world the less we get out of it, that the less we make of it the more we get out of it. To know God as our Father and Christ as our Saviour, to see our home elsewhere as a fact, to be good and to find pleasure in right doing, to be holy and cultivate the beauty of character, this is got from the true bread. When we have found this true bread other and lower kinds of bread will be seen involved in it, and issue out of it. Charities, parochial organizations, school boards, parliamentary franchises, philosophies, art, will come from enthusiasms born of faith and love and worship.

W. W. PEYTON.

EARLY CHRISTIAN MONUMENTS IN PHRYGIA :
A STUDY IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

V.

BUT our immediate interest in the epitaph is the light it throws on the legendary biography of Avircius. It shows us the foundation in historical fact, and enables us to trace, at least in outline, the process by which the legend was formed. The memory of the historical Avircius was kept alive, not only by tradition, but also by religious ritual on the twenty-second of October, the anniversary of his death. In the various *Menæa*,¹ brief notes of different tenor are attached to his name: the titles "Equal of the Apostles" and "Miracle-worker" occur in some cases; in others an outline of his life is given in prose or metre. In one instance two obscure iambic lines are given: "Aberkios, rendering earth to earth, according to the law of mortals, accedes a God by adoption to Him who is God by nature." References which occur on other days to an "Aberkios, bishop and martyr," seem to be due to some confusion of names.

Round this nucleus of fact gathered a mass of popular legend. The remarkable natural features of the district were attributed to the miraculous power of the saint; he became the hero in popular witticisms and in tales that had once been told of the pagan deities. But through all this accretion the main facts of the period when he lived and his wide travels and great influence at home shone forth. The writer of the biography, a man possessing a fair amount of education, set to work about A.D. 400 to give literary form to the legend. The epitaph was still before his eyes, and

¹ The *Menæa* are indeed all later than the biography, but they may be taken as an indication of the amount of information preserved by the Church ritual about him.

he copied it, complaining of the faintness of the letters,¹ though at the present day they are clearer than three-fourths of the local inscriptions. He expanded and filled up the outlines of the popular legend, using his rather inaccurate historical knowledge for the purpose. He shows himself well acquainted with the geography of Phrygia, but absolutely ignorant of that of the world beyond Asia Minor, and is thus proved to be a native of the country.

To illustrate the gradual progress of investigation, it is not without importance to describe the way in which the evidence bearing on the epitaph of Avircius was accumulated. In October, 1881, when wandering among the villages of a wide and fertile plain in central Phrygia, we observed the following inscription on a stone at the door of a mosque. The inscribed side was towards the wall, and so close to it that it was very hard to read it by sidelong glances. The surface is mutilated, and the following text is completed by the aid of the biography. When I published the text in 1882 I was ignorant even of the name of that Phrygian saint.

30. *"Citizen of the select city, I have, while still living, made this (tomb), that I may have here before the eyes of men a place where to lay my body; I, who am named Alexander, son of Antonius, a disciple of the spotless Shepherd. No one shall place another in my tomb: and if he do, he shall pay 2,000 gold pieces to the treasury of the Romans, and 1,000 to our excellent fatherland Hierapolis."*

"It was written in the year 300 (A.D. 216) during my lifetime. Peace to them that pass by and think of me."

This epitaph alone would furnish indubitable evidence as to the epitaph of Avircius, from which it quotes five lines, spoiling the metre by substituting for the name Avircius "Alexander son of Antonius." It also proves that the original is earlier than A.D. 216. These inferences were drawn by Di Rossi and Duchesne immediately on the pub-

¹ Hence are to be explained perhaps some variations such as *καρφῶ* for *φανερώς* in line 2.

lication of the epitaph of Alexander. In June, 1883, I again found time to visit the valley, accompanied by an American friend, Mr. Sterrett; and again in October, 1883, I made another visit alone to clear up some further difficulties. The result was the complete proof that the valley bore in ancient time the name Pentapolis,¹ from the five cities which it contained, Eucarpia, Hierapolis or Hieropolis, Otrous, Brouzos, and Stectorion, and the discovery of part of the actual tombstone of the saint, which has since been brought home to this country as a precious historical document.

Literature has not utterly lost trace of the Phrygian saint. From the tract against Montanism, written by a presbyter of the Pentapolis, and addressed to the saint, in the year 192, we learn that his name was Avircius Marcellus, and we gather an idea of the respect in which he was held, as well as of the position he took up on the great ecclesiastical question of the day. Even the form of the name is important. The later form Aberkios produces a false impression about it. Every element of Avircius is Italic, and we are not surprised to find Avircius and Avircia occurring several times in the inscriptions of Rome and of Gaul.² On the other hand, it has none of the Anatolian character about it, and the few examples of it that are known in Asia Minor are due solely to the influence and fame of the saint. Now Roman names are, it is true, not very rare in Phrygia; but the great majority are names of emperors; and of the remainder some few are due perhaps to the popularity of provincial governors, one or two such as Gaius and Quintus are taken as typical Roman names (if they do not really belong to the imperial class), and the others come from Italian settlers in the great cities. Such a distinctively Italian name as Avircius Marcellus, belonging to a Phrygian

¹ This name is preserved to us only in one authority; viz. the signature of a bishop at the Council of Chalcedon.

² *Corpus Inscr. Lat.*, vi. 12,923-5 (Avircius), xii. 1,052 (Avercius).

born about 120-130 A.D., appears to any one that studies the character of Phrygian names to be explicable only on the supposition that the bearer belongs to an Italian family settled in Phrygia. The noble name Marcellus might be adopted in a purely Phrygian family; but not such a plebeian and almost unknown name as Avircius. This Phrygian saint then is an instance of the return influence exerted by the West on the East; and may be set against the more usual influence of the East upon the West.

The name Avircius lasted in central Phrygian nomenclature. The Bishop of Hierapolis who was present at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. signs himself Aberkios (with the later Greek spelling), a clear proof that the saint was still remembered in the district; and according to the interpretation given above, the biography shows that he was remembered about 400. Inscriptions support the same conclusion. The first which I have to quote belongs to Prymnessos, a city and bishopric distant about twenty-seven miles by a very circuitous road from Hierapolis.

31. "*Aurelius Dorotheos, son of Abirkios, constructed the heroön for himself and for my mother Marcellina, and for my own children and for my cousins. Fare ye well who pass by.*"

Above the inscription are the Christian symbols Λ Φ Ω .

In this inscription the general form, the pagan word heroön, and still more the salutation at the end are characteristic of the third century, while the symbols might incline us rather to a fourth century date. The monument may probably be dated about or soon after 300. Abirkios was married to Marcellina;¹ the conjecture suggests itself that Marcellina belongs to the family of Avircius Marcellus, and that the cousins who are included in this almost unique fashion belonged to the same family.

I have already alluded to the possibility that Marcella,

¹ Bishop Lightfoot, who quotes this text in his *Ignatius and Polycarp*, i., p. 485, by a slip speaks of Marcellina as mother, instead of wife, of Abirkios.

the "highly respected and beloved" wife of Aurelius Eutyches Helix, senator of Eumeneia, may have belonged to the same family.¹

The next inscription which I have to quote belongs also to Prymnessos. As it mentions a deacon, it must be later than the time of Constantine; but the style of art in the relief that accompanies the inscription seems to be not later than the fourth century, so that the date of the monument is about 320-400 A.D.

32. "*Abirkios, son of Porphyrios, deacon, constructed the memorion to himself and my wife Theuprepia and the children.*"

The word *memorion* in the sense of tomb and the form *διάκων* for *διάκονος* are both marks of lateness, so that a date near 400 may be considered probable. A later date seems to me unlikely on account of the style of art in the relief, which is carved beneath the inscription. In the centre is a standing figure, slightly turned to the right, dressed in a mantle, and holding the right hand in front of the breast in the attitude of warning or admonition, thumb and first two fingers extended, and third and fourth fingers closed.² The figure is rather awkwardly shortened. The face, seen in profile, is youthful, beardless, and of a conventional Greek type. Right and left are busts, on a rather larger scale, both shown in profile. That on the right is female, in remarkably good style, obviously a portrait of a matron of middle age and decided beauty, with slight indication of a double chin. The bust on the left is made in the same conventional Greek style as the head of the central figure. The two faces look towards the central figure. The intention of the artist seems to be to show the Saviour admonishing Abirkios and Theuprepia. On early Italian Christian sarcophagi the Saviour is represented as

¹ THE EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1888, p. 422: the epitaph contains a veiled reminiscence of a phrase in the opening line of Avircius's epitaph.

² The same position of the hand which is employed in benediction.

a young and beardless man very similarly to this relief. This monument is, I think, the only early representation of its kind left us by the Eastern Church.

In one of the letters of Basil of Cæsareia, a person named Abourgios is mentioned. It is not improbable that this is a Cappadocian corruption of the same name, in which case we have a proof that the fame of the Phrygian saint extended far to the east. I have observed no other example of the name, but the three instances from the fourth century, and one from the fifth, of such a peculiar name, show the persistence of his fame at the very time when I have argued that his biography was written.

One point more remains. Is it possible to recover a clearer idea of the position and influence of this Phrygian, who, after having been forgotten for many centuries, has recently risen to fresh reputation? If the cause of which he was the champion had been thoroughly popular in Phrygia, it is probable that his name would have occurred more frequently, and his fame would have remained in the popular memory much longer. But it has been stated already (*THE EXPOSITOR*, Feb., p. 147) that the orthodox party was undoubtedly the weaker side in the Phrygian Church, being kept in power by the pressure from the Church in general, and at a later time by the power of the State. Thus it has happened that the fame of Avircius has not been proportionate to the glowing account given in his biography. He was the champion of a minority in Phrygia, and while "they who thought with him" cherished his name and exaggerated his actions, the world, which is rarely deceived by the passionate admiration of a minority, practically forgot him. But, while we must reduce his personality to its true dimensions, which fall far short of the pretensions of his biographer, he remains none the less a most interesting character, and his epitaph a document of real importance.

We have seen the probability that Avircius belonged to a foreign family from the West settled in Phrygia. The district where he lived is in the basin of the Mæander, the part of Phrygia which was most open to external influence and most closely connected with the rest of the world. His wide travels further brought home to his mind the power and extent of the Church, and his epitaph shows what an impression was made on him by the fact that everywhere he found the Christians united in the same belief and practice with himself. His whole experience conspired to make him the champion of the Church Catholic against the individualizing tendency of Montanism. A less bigoted and more tolerant spirit might perhaps have avoided the dissension that occurred, as was the case at a later date in Cappadocia,¹ and might have retained within the Church the national tone and fervour of the Montanists.

Montanus, on the other hand, belonged by birth to north-western Phrygia. He was a convert, first heard of at a village Ardabau, on the frontier between Mysia and Phrygia, a description which points to the same neighbourhood where we have found clear traces of the north-western Phrygian Church. Does Montanus represent the tone of that Church; and does the beginning of the Montanist controversy correspond to the time when the christianizing influence spreading from the north-west met that which was penetrating from the south-west? If we can see any reason to answer this question affirmatively, our investigation will have gradually led us to something like a distinct view of the general character of that north-western Phrygian Church which was detected and described in the first of these papers. The following arguments show that the answer in all probability must be affirmative.

¹ I hope to describe the episode at some later time: it has remained practically unnoticed by any modern writer, as topographical accuracy is necessary for the understanding of the few recorded details.

The Church of south-western and central Phrygia, connected closely with Laodiceia and the Lycus valley, and originally founded therefrom, is naturally more catholic and less Phrygian in tone; whereas everything that we can learn of northern Phrygia shows it to have been the special stronghold of heresy and of the specially Phrygian type of religion. In the fourth century, Cotiaion was the chief centre of Novatianism in Phrygia: now Novatianism revives one of the tenets of Montanism,

“—that un pitying Phrygian sect which cried,
Him can no fount of fresh forgiveness lave,
Who sins, once washed by the baptismal wave.”

Under the Arian Valens and the tolerant Valentinian Phrygian heresy flourished free, but in the beginning of the following century, under Theodosius II. and his sister Pulcheria, a determined effort seems to have been made to force Cotiaion into orthodoxy. Four bishops in succession were murdered by the people, and we may gather that they were bishops of the orthodox faith, imposed by the party in power on an unwilling people, and that the resistance of the latter was carried to bloodshed. At last Cyrus, a man trained in civil government and administration, was made a priest and sent to rule the Church of Cotiaion; and by a dexterous address he gained a footing in the city. Again at Pazos, near the source of the Sangarius, a Novatian synod was held; and Amorion is always famous as a heretical centre. Now I have already shown that Cotiaion was the centre during the third century of the north Phrygian style of Christianity, and that in later time it preserved its separation from the rest of Phrygia as metropolis of the surrounding district. The district was remote from intercourse with external civilization, and infinitely less exposed to influence from contact with the Church in general than the basin of the Mæander. It is by later ecclesiastical writers spoken of sometimes with

contempt for its ignorance, sometimes with hatred for its heresy. Attempts to force it into orthodoxy result even in bloodshed. The conclusion seems necessary that the same characteristic and exclusive Phrygian tone characterized it from the beginning, and that Montanus, born in the midst of it, represents its tendencies in conflict with the catholicism of the south Phrygian Church.

This investigation has given a very different view of the position and action of Avircius from the biography. In the latter he is the apostle of Christianity in a pagan land; he is adored by his people, and no hint is dropped of dissension or controversy among them. The epitaph, whose real meaning has been obscured to modern scholars by the tone of the biography, has now been interpreted to show Avircius, not as the missionary of a new religion, but as the leader of a party in a Church already well established, and now divided against itself. His party was victorious, after a keen and bitter contest, in his own neighbourhood, but in the greater part of Phrygia the opposite sect was far stronger.¹ The Phrygian heretical tendency, vouched for by the hatred of the orthodox historians in later times, has now been traced back, through the inscriptions of the third century (Nos. 1 to 12), to its origin in an isolated current of christianizing influence; and has been shown to be a vigorous form of religion, redolent of the soil where it was rooted, spreading unchecked towards the south till it met the Catholic Church. The first passages in the long struggle between nationalism and universalism in Phrygia are connected with the respective leaders, Montanus and Avircius. To the fact that controversy divided those who ought to have felt that they were really of one mind must be attributed the extirpation of Christianity in Phrygia.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ This is exactly the tone of the account given by Eusebius.

PRIMITIVE LITURGIES AND CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

I.

THE evangelist St. Luke, in the preface to his gospel, has seen fit to lay before us his reasons for publishing a new record of the Lord Jesus' life. There were already many διηγήσεις of doubtful authority, but he would now so write that his friend Theophilus might be furnished with facts upon which he could implicitly rely, and hence arrive at a fuller assurance regarding those λόγους¹ in which he had been systematically instructed.

2. Again, in his Book of the Acts of the Apostles, when the same evangelist introduces Apollos to the notice of his readers, he describes him as "mighty in the Scriptures," and as one who had been "systematically instructed" in "THE WAY" of the Lord.²

3. Once more, we read that when Sergius Paulus, the proconsul at Cyprus, was impressed by the Apostles' preaching, and gave in his adherence to the truths proclaimed, he believed, startled by the διδασχὴ of the Lord.³

4. Lastly, when Elymas strove to hinder the work begun, and to weaken the impression that had been made, we are told "he sought to turn away the procurator from *the faith*" (ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως); and when in the sixth chapter we hear of a great multitude of priests being convinced, it is said of them ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει.

¹ ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

² οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου (Acts xviii. 25). Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17.

³ ἐκπλησσομένης ἐπὶ τῇ διδασχῇ τοῦ Κυρίου (Acts xiii. 12).

A careful comparison of the passages referred to, with many others that will come under review in the following pages, forces upon us the conviction that the four terms here employed, ὁ λόγος, ἡ διδαχή, ἡ ὁδός, and ἡ πίστις, all refer substantially to the same thing. Viewed with reference to the speaker who by word of mouth rendered an *account* of what was to be believed, it was λόγος; viewed with reference to the teacher who instructed, or the neophyte who received *instruction*, it was ἡ διδαχή; while as it was a summary of those things which were most surely *believed*, it was ἡ πίστις; and as the *line along which all dogmatic exposition was to travel*, it was ἡ ὁδός.

It would happen in the natural course, that as one term became (so to speak) the favourite, this term would tend to thrust the others out of use; and accordingly it appears that one of these terms, ἡ ὁδός, did actually cease to be employed very early; but there is abundant evidence of the fact, that, while the organization of the infant Church was still imperfect, these four terms were used as practically convertible.

Thus the διδαχή τοῦ Κυρίου of the 12th verse of Acts xiii. is plainly the λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου of the 48th and 49th verses, and as plainly the ὁδός τοῦ Κυρίου of Acts xviii. 25, and the πίστις τοῦ Κυρίου of St. James ii. 1.

Again the ὁδός σωτηρίας of Acts xvi. 17 is clearly the λόγος σωτηρίας of Acts xiii. 26, and probably the κοινὴ σωτηρία of St. Jude (Jude 3), while the ὁδός, which St. Paul declares he once persecuted, and of which (Acts xix. 9) we hear certain men spake evil before the people, can be no other than the πίστις in which Paul and Barnabas besought the men of Pisidia to abide,¹ in which the Churches were confirmed as they increased in number daily,² the πίστις which St. Paul when he had finished his course glories in

¹ παρακαλοῦντες ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει (Acts xiv. 22).

² αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ πίστει, κ.τ.λ. (Acts xvi. 5).

having kept,¹ and that which in its later and more expanded form he refers to again and again under the designations of ἡ καλὴ παραθήκη, ὁ πιστὸς λόγος, ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία, and other names, with which we shall attempt in the sequel to deal in fuller detail.

That these four terms refer to a Formulated Summary of Primitive Christian Doctrine is the first position which this article attempts to support.

Such a summary would of course serve more than a single purpose. To the preacher of the Redeemer's truth it was a guide and safeguard, keeping him from license in speculation and rashness in assertion. To the anxious inquirer, desirous to enter the Church, it was a simple elementary instruction in the primary essentials of the Christian faith. To the newly baptized believer it was a blessed memento of the solemn profession he had made at the laver of regeneration, when he had "passed from death unto life, and from the power of Satan unto God."

Hence it is only what we should expect if the writers of the several epistles appeal to and allude to this summary of Christian truth as to a palladium which each Christian would naturally hold very dear. Renegades who had left the Church under the pressure of persecution are called ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν (2 Tim. iii. 8), or are said ἀρνοῦσθαι τὴν πίστιν.² Timothy is exhorted ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως (1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7), and in the Apocalypse the ἅγιοι are described as those οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ (Apoc. xiv. 12).

That something like a dogmatic Confession of Faith was drawn up very soon after the ascension of our Lord appears from the nature of the case more than probable. It is

¹ τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα (2 Tim. iv. 7).

² . . . τὴν πίστιν ἥρνηται καὶ ἔστιν ἀπίστος χειρὸν (1 Tim. v. 8). Compare Apoc. ii. 13, οὐκ ἀρνήσω τὴν πίστιν μου.

scarcely conceivable that the new society, by no means blind to the immense destiny which was before it, and the mighty work it was to carry out, should have remained long without some organized machinery for proselytizing, and some discipline for the regulation of its inner life and the display of its necessary activity.

Accordingly, no sooner do we read that three thousand were added to the Church in a single day, than we are assured that these same new converts continued steadfastly attending to the doctrines of the Apostles, and to *the* common contribution, and to *the* breaking of bread, and to *the* prayers.¹ The force of the article in these passages can by no means be passed over. In every single instance the term employed is a technical term, which subsequently attained an important significance, and if "the breaking of bread" must be taken to refer to a religious rite, and the *κοινωνία* must as certainly be assumed to point to a general contribution to a common fund—such as Macedonia and Achaia afterwards made for the relief of the poor saints at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 26), which the Hebrew Christians were specially admonished not to neglect (Heb. xiii. 16), and which the Corinthians are commended for having carried out with simple liberality (2 Cor. ix. 13)—not less certainly must the *διδασχῇ* be understood to refer to an authoritative and dogmatic exposition of the fundamental verities of the Christian faith; while by the *προσευχαί* are meant simple forms of prayer, which would be among the very first necessities of the multitudes whose awakened consciences and whose excited feelings would require that the outpourings of their emotions should be guided, instructed, and controlled, and the worshipper preserved from spasmodical utterances apt to run riot into wildness and extravagance.

Nor are allusions to such forms of prayer wanting. When

¹ Acts ii. 42: ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδασχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς. Cf. Ephesians vi. 18.

the continued growth of the Church had brought with it an increase in the number of those distracting engagements which constitute the most serious interruptions to the work of an evangelist, then it was seen that the governing body of the Church needed to be relieved in some way from the immense pressure of mere business which threatened to embarrass and overwhelm the apostolic college. The diaconate was accordingly instituted. To the deacons was committed the administration of the *κοινωνία*, "but," said the Twelve, "*we* will give our attention to the prayers and to the ministry of the *λόγος*." ¹

But in truth nothing is more remarkable in the history of the Church than the promptness with which the Apostles set themselves to legislate for special occasions, and the wisdom they exhibit in dealing with difficulties as they arise. I have already alluded to the institution of the order of deacons; no less striking is the ordaining of Barnabas and Saul (Acts xiii.) for the extraordinary mission at Antioch; the provision for allaying the prejudice against St. Paul on his last recorded return to Jerusalem; and, above all, the publication of the *δόγματα* on the question of admitting Gentiles into the fold of Christ.

On this occasion (Acts xv. 6 and *seq.*) we find that the apostolic college, seeing the gravity of the point at issue, and that a crisis in the history of the Church had come, hesitated to put forth any canons on their own authority solely, but calling a council of the whole Church at Jerusalem, they solemnly deliberated upon the course to be adopted, and only after long discussion and devout inquiry did they finally agree upon the important point that was raised. But the *δόγματα* once having been passed, no time was lost in giving them publicity (Acts xv. 22). A formal copy of the resolution passed at the meeting of the council

¹ ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου προσκατερέσμεν (Acts vi. 4). Compare here the use of *διακονία* (Rom. xii. 7).

was committed to Paul, Barnabas, and Silas, and these distinguished servants of the Church were at once sent forth to promulgate the canon. In this case there can be no doubt that we have the actual words of the letter with which the commissioners were furnished. We are expressly told that the decree was disseminated as widely as possible, and that it was imposed upon the several Churches as an ordinance binding upon all who were baptized in the name of Christ. It is moreover observable that these ordinances were not promulgated once, and once only, and that when the special occasion had passed they were forgotten; on the contrary, the *δόγματα* of the council at Jerusalem were evidently imposed as fundamental conditions of union upon every new Christian community which was afterwards admitted into Church membership, and more than once we meet with allusions to these decrees in epistles to Churches *which were not founded for some years after the council was held*. Thus it can scarcely be doubted that the *παραγγελίαι* which St. Paul speaks of having given to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. iv. 2), regarding fornication, refer to these early *δόγματα*, for so only can we explain the full force of his language, where he says that they had been given *διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*, *i.e.* by the instrumentality of the Lord Jesus; and a large portion of the first epistle to the Corinthian Church appears actually taken up with explaining and enforcing those very decrees on the subject of fornication and things offered to idols, as against those who assumed that the *δόγματα* were only meant for such as were “babes in Christ,” but no longer binding upon advanced Christians who had risen to the apprehension of an esoteric *γνώσις*.

How then can it be conceived that any time should have been lost in drawing up a confession of faith for the guidance of the teacher and the support of the taught? especially when it is remembered that all this wonderful progress—all this Divine awakening of men’s minds, and

this eager acceptance of Christ—was going on for years before the earliest of our gospels was composed, nay, probably before two of our evangelists were converted to the faith at all. For it must never be forgotten that the growth of the Church was not due to the gospels, but that the gospels sprang into being from the needs of the Church.

Hence it appears not so very improbable that the ancient tradition of the Apostles' Creed being actually composed by the Twelve may have some basis of truth to repose on. I have already pointed out that the expression *διδασχὴ τοῦ Κυρίου* is to be regarded as the equivalent of the *ὁδὸς τοῦ Κυρίου*: but in the second chapter of the Acts, ver. 42, we find this term in another form; it is there called *διδασχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, as though the very first work which the Apostles had set themselves to labour at (possibly in that awful time of suspense and anxious expectation which preceded the day of Pentecost) had been the drawing up of some short summary of doctrine in conformity with which all the teaching of the future should be carried on. And one very striking passage in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which it appears to me commentators so far have misunderstood, affords a remarkable confirmation of this view. In the eleventh chapter of the epistle and the sixth verse, St. Paul is contrasting his own claims to be listened to with those put forth by the false teachers at Corinth.¹ "For," says he, "I reckon myself in no respect to have fallen short of the chiefest Apostles"; for although an unofficial person in regard to the *λόγος*, I am not so in regard of the *γνώσις*: *i.e.* in the drawing up of the first elementary summary of Christian doctrine I took no part, for I was no Apostle then, yet in the fuller and more developed ex-

¹ λογίζομαι γὰρ μηδὲν ὑστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπὲρ λαὸν ἀποστόλων. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει· ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ φανερώσαντες ἐν πᾶσι εἰς ὑμᾶς. Taking this view of the passage, it appears to me that the reading *φανερώσαντες* becomes the only intelligible one; the diplomatic evidence in its favour is overwhelming.

position of the faith—the *γνώσις*—I did take my part, and my apostleship was acknowledged.

This is that *λόγος* which he subsequently commands Timothy to proclaim (2 Tim. iv. 2)—*κήρυξον τὸν λόγον*—and to persist in with all patience in teaching, “because,” he adds, “the time will come when people will not endure the wholesome doctrine, but will choose teachers according to their own fancies.” This is that *λόγος ἀκοῆς* which the Thessalonians (1 Thess. ii. 13) are said to have received not as a human, but as a Divine *λόγος*, as in truth it was. This is that *λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* which the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv. 36) are reminded did not go out from them, but came to them. This is that *λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου* of which, in writing to the Thessalonians, the Apostle prays that it may have free course and be glorified. Lastly, it is that *τύπος διδαχῆς* to which at their baptism the Roman Christians were handed over, and by virtue of the reception of which they were freed from the bondage of sin and bound by a new bond to righteousness (Rom. vi. 17).

But this passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians, which puts in such marked contrast the *λόγος* (or primary and elementary summary of the faith) and the *γνώσις* (or esoteric doctrine to which probably the Christian was introduced only after his baptism), brings us to a further examination of those passages where the *γνώσις* is alluded to.

It must be conceded that, as a technical term, *ἡ γνώσις* appears much more frequently in the epistles to the Corinthians than anywhere else in the New Testament; but, though this might suggest the hypothesis that the origin of the term is to be traced to the Corinthian Church in the first instance, we do meet with it in its technical sense in other apostolic writings.

In the epistles to the Corinthians however the passage referred to above by no means stands alone. A plain allusion to this distinction between the *πίστις* and the

γνώσις is to be met with in the thirteenth chapter of the first epistle, where the commentators, as far as my observation goes, have failed to point out the right explanation of the acknowledged difficulty. The second verse stands thus: καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω προφητείαν (observe, no definite article) καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γνώσιν, καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάνειν, ἀγάπην δὲ (again no definite article) μὴ ἔχω, οὐθέν εἰμι. The passage should, I believe, be thus translated: "And if I have a gift of prophecy, and know *all the mysteries and the whole* γνώσις; and if *I hold the whole* πίστις to such an extent as to remove mountains, yet have not love, I am nothing." The εἰδέναι τὰ μυστήρια is illustrated by another passage in the eighth chapter, which will be discussed hereafter; but the distinction between τὴν πίστιν and τὴν γνώσιν appears obvious.

In the first chapter of this epistle a no less evident and significant allusion is to be found. At the fifth verse the Apostle gives thanks to God ὅτι ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει, καθὼς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν; *i.e.* Because ye were enriched by Him¹ in every way, to wit, ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει. That these words are extremely difficult of translation is certain; yet I feel no doubt that the true key to the meaning of the expression is to be sought in that marked distinction between the two terms which has been pointed out before.²

¹ I regard the first ἐν παντὶ as equivalent to an adverb of manner; the second παντὶ is in close concord with λόγῳ, and only affected by the preposition in so far as it agrees with its noun; ἐν αὐτῷ is here instrumental, as in Rom. v. 9, 10, and, as I believe, much more frequently in St. Paul than is usually supposed. See Ellicott on Eph. ii. 13.

Cf. Eur. Ion. 1071: οὐ γὰρ . . . ἴδῃσα ποτ' ὀμμάτων ἐν φαειναῖς ἀνέχου' ἐν αὐγαῖς, κ.τ.λ.; *i.e.* she will never, if she lives, endure *with* her bright eyes, etc., etc.

² It is quite possible that allusion is made to the existence of distinctive γόλοι or γνώσεις among the conflicting Church parties at Corinth.

A similar allusion to this esoteric *γνώσις* is observable in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. St. Paul is there insisting that Jew and Gentile are equally liable to the righteous judgment of God. He puts the case thus (Rom. ii. 17): "But you call yourself a Jew, and rest upon the law, and boast yourself in God, and know His will, and are examining points of difference, *having had your catechising out of the law*, and believe yourself to be a leader of the blind, a light to those in darkness, an instructor of the simple, a teacher of babes, *having your form of the γνώσις and of the truth in the law*. . . ." ¹ Whatever else the word *γνώσις* may mean, it certainly is not adequately represented by the English word "knowledge." Here, as elsewhere, the significance of the definite article can by no means be passed over; and if the *ἀληθεία* here be the *λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας* of the Second Epistle to Timothy and elsewhere, the *πιστὸς λόγος*, the *λόγος σωτηρίας*, called in the Acts (ii. 42) the *διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, then the *γνώσις* here, as in the former passage to which attention has been drawn, can be no other than the fuller and more expanded summary of the faith which received this technical name.

One more passage must be noticed in which the same allusion is to be found. I refer to the fervent and sublime prayer for the Ephesian converts. Here again the significance of the definite article is to be insisted on, and the

¹ *Εἰ δὲ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ, καὶ καυχᾶσαι ἐν Θεῷ, καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα, καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα, κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου* Anything like a discussion of the *syntactical* difficulties of this passage would be beyond my province here; but I feel no doubt, (1) that the verbs *ἐπονομάζῃ*, *ἐπαναπαύῃ*, and *καυχᾶσαι* are all to be taken as *middle verbs*; (2) that *δοκιμάζεις* is to be taken in the sense of "testing" or "examining" (see Bp. Ellicott on Eph. v. 10); (3) that *τὰ διαφέροντα*, whatever else it may mean (and how widely different the meanings given to it have been may be seen in Ellicott, Phil. i. 10), cannot here mean "things which transcend," even though so profound a scholar as Bishop Lightfoot has so rendered the phrase in the parallel passage.

distinction between *πίστις* and *γνώσις* to be carefully observed; and here too, I believe, as elsewhere, that the key to the obscurity of the eighteenth verse is to be found in looking upon it as containing allusions to the *mystical phraseology of the theosophic formulæ* with which the half-instructed converts of Ephesus (as of Corinth, Colossæ, and elsewhere) would be acquainted, and from which deliverance was to be sought by giving greater prominence to the ethical element in Christianity. The Apostle thus begins: “. . . I bow my knees to the Father, . . . that He may grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to receive strength with power by means of His Spirit into the inner man; so as for Christ to take up His abode in your hearts, *by means of the faith*—being rooted in love as ye are, and having had your foundation laid—in order that ye may be thoroughly able to comprehend with all the saints what is [the true significance of] the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and [be able] to know Christ’s love, which transcends the *γνώσις*, in order that [as the *final result*] ye may be filled to all the fulness of God.”¹ A beginning might be made when the *πίστις* was

¹ . . . κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, . . . ἵνα ὡς ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ δυνάμει κραταιωθῇναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, κατοικήσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζώμενοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι, ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβεῖσθαι σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μήκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος, γινώσκει τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (Eph. iii. 14–19).

With regard to the *grammar* of this passage, it will be sufficient to note—(1) that *κραταιωθῇναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος* and *κατοικήσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως* must necessarily be taken as expressing *instrumentality*: the *πνεῦμα* is the instrument in one case, the *πίστις* in the other; (2) that *κατοικήσαι* is *consecutive* upon *κραταίωθῇναι*; (3) that *ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε* expresses the primary purpose, or result that the prayer has in view; (4) that *ἵνα πληρωθῇτε* marks the ultimate purpose, *καταλαβεῖσθαι* indicates intellectual apprehension, *γινώσκει* experimental fruition.

WHAT St. Paul prays for is, that the Ephesians may receive Christ into their “heart of hearts”; they had accepted “the faith,” and the beginnings of a sanctifying emotion had become manifest, but growth in Christian experience was extremely desirable, and this he prays they may attain.

WHY that growth was so desirable he explains

accepted, when the neophyte put on Christ, and through the *γνώσις* he might make a step in advance; but real progress was first made when Christ was accepted with the heart, and when the mere intellectual *γνώσις* was supplemented by love—the soil in which the Christian could alone hope to grow and bring forth fruit to the end.

But as in the case of what I have called the primary or elementary summary of Christian doctrine, we find that in the as yet unsettled condition of Church government that summary is called by different names,—sometimes it is *ὁδὸς*, sometimes *λογος*, sometimes *πίστις*,—so is it probable that this esoteric *γνώσις* was designated by other equivalent terms. We need not go beyond the Epistle to the Ephesians itself to be convinced that the term *μυστήριον* was used as an equivalent of the other term *γνώσις*:¹ while from 1 Corinthians xv. 51, it would almost seem that any advanced statement was called a *μυστήριον*, any truth, *i.e.*, for which the babe in Christ might not be prepared, though it was meet and right that the more advanced Christian should be instructed in it. Thus in writing on the subject of the resurrection of the body, St. Paul draws attention to what he is about to say on the subject by calling it *μυστήριον*;² in the First Epistle to Timothy iii. 9, he orders that the deacons must be those *ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως*; a few verses later he speaks of *τὸ μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας*: and taking these passages in connexion with

(1) Because it would bring profounder insight into the infinite depths of the Divine mysteries, with which, if the *γνώσεις* professed to deal, they would but deal, at best, inadequately.

(2) Because it would bring more intimate *personal union* with Christ on the emotional side, with which the *γνώσεις* did not even pretend to deal.

(3) Because the final grand result would be that the convert would attain, at least in idea, to the fulness of the Divine perfection.

¹ Eph. iii. 4. I cannot accept Meyer's view of this expression, adopted by Alford and Bishop Ellicott. See *infra*.

² *Ἰδοὺ μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω* (1 Cor. xv. 51).

others in the apostolic writings, nor losing sight of the fact that the expression *τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας* is more than once used by our Lord—in a sense which certainly supports the view advocated—bearing in mind too that the use of the term in the Apocalypse can bear this interpretation only—I am irresistibly led to the conclusion that the term *μυστήριον* is in many passages of St. Paul a technical term (if the expression may be allowed), the equivalent of what is elsewhere called *γνώσις*; and that both refer to the advanced summaries of Christian instruction to which, as will appear in the sequel, such frequent allusion is made.

But having arrived at this point, it will be well if I simply recapitulate what has been said.

I. I have pointed out, that at the very beginning of the history of the Christian Church we find a formal summary of Christian doctrine referred to under four different terms: *ἡ ὁδός, ἡ διδαχὴ, ὁ λόγος, ἡ πίστις*.

II. That such a summary would be felt as a necessity when no written record of our Lord's life existed, and the Christian Church was increasing enormously day by day.

III. That in the general organization of the Church conspicuous wisdom and foresight were exhibited when emergencies arose, and that it was unlikely so primary a need as this should be left for long unsupplied.

Lastly, assuming that such a summary of fundamental Christian truth was drawn up thus early, that this *λόγος* or *διδαχὴ* was but a brief summary of primary Christian doctrine, possibly drawn up by the Twelve themselves; that the acceptance of this elementary creed was a condition of baptism; but that supplementary to this primary summary there appear to have been expanded statements of more advanced or esoteric doctrine—possibly less generally accepted, probably less widely diffused, and certainly less generally imposed; and that such an expanded state-

ment was called *γνώσις* or *μυστήριον*, and perhaps was known by other designations also.

It remains to consider what fragments of these original formularies of the faith are embedded, and may still be traced, in the writings of the New Testament.

AUGUSTUS JESSOPP.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

X. THE TEACHER'S COMPLAINT (CHAPS. v. 11-14, vi. 1-8).

"OF whom," *i.e.* Melchisedec, continues the writer, taking up the second part of his programme first, "we have many things to say." Yet he does not say these things; he refrains from entering on ample discourse (*πολὺς λόγος*) on the Melchisedec priesthood, because his spirit is disturbed by the recollection that he writes to persons dull of apprehension, at once ignorant, indolent, and prejudiced, unable and unwilling to take in new ideas, and, like horses with blinders on, capable of seeing only straight before them in the direction of use and wont, and therefore certain to find the thoughts he is about to express hard to understand. The haunting consciousness of this painful fact obscures the subject of discourse as a cloud hides the glory of the sun on an April day; and even as our Lord was not able to proceed with His farewell address to His disciples till He had rid Himself of the presence of the traitor, so this man of philosophic mind and eloquent pen cannot proceed with his argument till he has given expression to the vexation and disappointment caused by the inaptitude of his scholars. This he does with very great plainness of speech, for which all Christian teachers have reason to thank him; for what he has written may be regarded as an assertion of the right of the Church to be something more than an infant school, and a defence of the liberty of prophesying on all themes pertaining to Christ as their centre against the intolerance always manifested by ignorance, stupidity, indolence, and prejudice towards everything that is not old, familiar, and perfectly elementary.

The teacher's complaint is severe—too severe, if the

things to be said concerned some curious point in theology on which the complainer had some pet notions. A man may be a good Christian, and yet be ignorant or indifferent in reference to the mysteries of predestination and free will and their reconciliation. Might not the Hebrews be sufficiently good Christians, and yet remain ignorant of, or incapable of understanding, the transcendental doctrine of the Melchisedec priesthood? No; because the question at issue is not a mere curious point in theology. It is rather the fundamental question whether Christ was really a priest. The priesthood of Christ in its reality and ideal worth is not understood, unless it is seen to be of the Melchisedec type. Therefore the incapacity complained of, if not fatal, is at least serious.

The account given of the spiritual state of the Hebrew Christians is not flattering. In effect, they are represented as in their dotage. They have *become* dull of hearing, have *become* children having need of milk, and not able to receive the solid food of full grown men. They are not merely children, but in their second childhood; in which respect it is interesting to compare the Hebrew Church with the Corinthian as described in Paul's first epistle. The members of the Corinthian Church were in their first childhood spiritually; hence they were unruly, quarrelsome, and had an indiscriminate appetite for all sorts of food, without possessing the capacity to discern between what was wholesome and what unwholesome, or the self-control to choose the good and reject the evil. The members of the Hebrew Church, on the other hand, were in that state of dotage so affectingly described by Barzillai with reference to the physical powers: "I am this day fourscore years old; and can I discern between good and evil? can thy servant taste what I eat or what I drink? can I hear any more the voice of singing men and singing women? wherefore then should thy servant be yet a burden unto my lord the

king?" The Hebrew Christians had once had a certain capacity of discernment, but they had lost it. Their senses had become blunted by the hebetude of old age: they had, so to say, no teeth to eat solid food, no taste to discern the excellency of new, strong meat, but simply enough taste to detect that the meat was new; no ear to appreciate the new songs of the Christian era, but just enough hearing left to tell them that the sounds they heard dimly were strange, not the familiar melodies of the synagogue; no eyes to see the glory of Christ's self-sacrifice, but simply vision enough to perceive as through a haze the gorgeous robes of the high priest as he moved about the temple precincts performing his sacerdotal duties. All the symptoms of senility were upon them as described by the preacher; decay was present and death near. Melancholy end of a Christian profession that had lasted some forty years! Dotage at an advanced age, in the physical sphere, is natural and blameless, exciting only tender pity; in the spiritual sphere it is unnatural and blameworthy. What ought to be is steady progress towards moral and religious maturity (*τελειότητα*), characterized by practised skill to discern between good and evil, and settled preference for the good, a wise, enlightened mind, and a sanctified will.¹ That so few reach the goal, that healthy growth in the spiritual life is so rare, is for all earnest souls a wonder and a deep disappointment.

Having uttered these sharp words of reproof, the writer proceeds (vi. 1) to exhort his readers to aspire to that state

¹ The words *τέλειος* and *τελειότης* (v. 14, vi. 1) are used here in a sense distinct from that in which Christ is said to have been perfected by suffering, and from that in which men are said to have been perfected by His one offering of Himself. To be perfect is always to be in the position of having reached the end; but the end in the present instance is not training for an office, or purgation of the conscience from the guilt of sin, but the attainment of manhood, with the characteristics named above. Of the two characteristics only the wise mind, or experienced judgment, is referred to, because defective spiritual intelligence is the thing complained of.

of Christian maturity which is capable of digesting solid food, and not to remain always at the beginnings of the Christian life. Perhaps we should rather say, that the writer intimates his own purpose to go on in his discourse from the milk of elementary truth that suits babes to the solid food of advanced doctrine that suits men. The commentators are divided in opinion as to which of these two interpretations is the more correct; but it is scarcely worth while to discuss the question, as the one view implies the other. The writer does not wish merely to express his own thoughts concerning Christ's priestly office, but to communicate them to others. He desires to *teach*; but he can teach only in so far as there is receptivity in his scholars. Teaching and learning are correlative, and teacher and scholar must keep pace with each other. No man can teach unless his pupils let him. Therefore this Christian doctor, minded to discourse not of the *principia* of Christianity—"the beginning of Christ"—but of its higher truths, appropriately says, "Let us go on," expressing at once a purpose and an exhortation.

In declining to make the Christian elements his exclusive theme, the writer takes occasion to indicate what these were. We scan with eager interest the list of fundamentals setting forth what, in the view of our author, and we may assume also of the Church in his time, a man was required to do and believe when he became a Christian. What first strikes one in this primitive "sum of saving knowledge" is how little that is specifically Christian it contains. There is no express reference to Christ, not even in connexion with faith, where it might have been expected. In his address to the elders at Miletus, Paul claimed to have testified to Jews and Greeks "repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." Here, on the other hand, mention is made of "repentance from dead works, and faith towards God," as if it were a question of theism as

against polytheism, rather than of Christian belief.¹ It is superfluous to remark that the priesthood of Christ finds no place in the list; that topic evidently is regarded as belonging to the advanced doctrine. To us, who have been accustomed to regard faith in the atoning death of Christ, and even in a particular theory of the atonement, as essential to salvation, all this must appear surprising. Yet the meagre account here given of the catechumen's creed is no isolated phenomenon in the New Testament. It is in entire accord with what we learn from Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians, which may be said to show the style of his instructions to young converts during the period of missionary activity antecedent to the rise of the great controversy concerning the law. Paul's purpose in that epistle seems to be to remind the Thessalonian Christians, for their encouragement and strengthening, of the things he had taught them at the time of their conversion, such phrases as "ye remember," "ye know," being of frequent occurrence. Yet throughout the epistle we can find no trace of the doctrine of justification in the specifically Pauline sense, or of the doctrine of Christ's atoning death. Christ's death is indeed referred to, but in such a way as to suggest that the fact of vital importance to faith was not that He died, but that He rose again. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."²

The apparently non-Christian character of the Christian *principia* is not the only perplexing feature in the list of fundamentals. It is not easy to determine how the various matters mentioned are related to each other. Judging from the rhythmical structure of the sentence, one's first thought

¹ A few commentators have actually maintained that the reference is not to the Christian elements but to the leading points in the Old Testament religion, faith in the true God, and the rites of purification and laying on of hands on the sacrificial victims, of typical significance for the Christian religion.

² 1 Thess. iv. 14.

is that the list contains six co-ordinate articles, grouped in pairs: first, repentance and faith; second, the doctrines of baptism and laying on of hands; third, the doctrines of resurrection and eternal judgment; the members of each pair being of kindred nature, and the whole six forming together the foundation of the Christian religion. But doubt arises when it is observed that in this view things are mixed together which belong to different categories; repentance and faith, which are spiritual states, with *doctrines* about other matters of greater or less importance. If there are six articles in the list of fundamentals, why not say, "Not laying again a foundation in doctrine concerning repentance, faith, baptisms," etc.? And so we are tempted to take up with another hypothesis; *viz.* that the last four are to be regarded as the foundation of the first two, conceived not as belonging to the foundation, but rather as the superstructure. On this view we should have to render, "Not laying again a foundation for repentance and faith, consisting in instruction concerning baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection, and judgment." In favour of this construction is the reading *διδάχην* (ver. 2, clause 1) found in B, and adopted by Westcott and Hort, which being in apposition with *θεμέλιον* (ver. 1) suggests that the four things following form the foundation of repentance and faith.

It is possible that the mixing up of states and doctrines in the list is due to the double attitude of the writer, as partly exhorting his readers, partly expressing his own purpose. "Not laying again a foundation, you by renewed repentance and faith, by repetition of elementary instructions." But I cannot help thinking that there is discernible in this passage, notwithstanding its graceful rhythmical structure, on which Bengel and others have remarked, a slight touch of that rhetorical carelessness which recurs in much more pronounced form in chapter ix. 10, where the writer, referring to the ineffectual ordinances

of Levitical worship, characterizes them in language difficult to construe as "only, with their meats and drinks and diverse washings, ordinances of the flesh imposed until a time of reformation." In that place the loose construction of the sentence is an oratorical device to express a feeling of impatience with the bare idea that Levitical rites could possibly cleanse the consciences of worshippers. Of course the writer has no thought of putting the elementary truths of Christianity on a level with these rites. But the feeling of impatience with never getting beyond the elements seems to influence his manner of referring to them, giving rise to an elliptical abruptness of style which leaves room for many questions as to the construction that cannot with certainty be answered.

On the whole, our first thought as to the connexion is probably the correct one, according to which the passage is to be paraphrased thus: "Leaving discourse on the beginning of Christ, let us go on unto maturity, and unto the doctrine that suits it, not laying again a foundation in reiterated exhortations to repentance and faith, and in instructions about such matters as baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment."

The only points calling for explanation in this summary of elements are those included in the middle pair. Repentance and faith, the resurrection and the judgment, are obviously suitable subjects of instruction for persons beginning the Christian life. Repentance and faith are the cardinal conditions of entrance into the kingdom of God,¹

¹ Mark i. 15: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel." I reserve for consideration in another place (chap. ix. 14) the meaning of the words ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων attached to μεταβολας. I will merely say here, that it is by no means so clear as most commentators assume it to be that "dead works" are synonymous with "sinful works," and that there is no reference to the religious works of an artificial legalism, which first our Lord and then Paul declared to be worthless and pernicious. Of such works, in a transition time, when an old religion is dying and a new religion is coming in, there are always plenty; and converts from

and though resurrection and judgment, as events, come at the end of the Christian's career, the doctrine concerning them comes appropriately at the beginning, as fitted to inspire an awe and a hope which are most powerful motives to holiness.

But what is the doctrine of baptisms? If instruction as to Christian baptism be mainly referred to, its appropriateness at the commencement is beyond question. But why baptisms and not baptism? Commentators generally concur in replying, because the writer has in view, not merely Christian baptism, but all the baptisms or washings with which Jewish converts were familiar. Where symbolic use of water in various forms was known, comparison would be natural, and might be useful as a means of conveying instruction as to the distinctive significance of Christian baptism. Against the reference to baptism in the specifically Christian sense it has been urged that it is never, in the New Testament, denoted by *βαπτισμός*, the word used here, but always by *βάπτισμα*. To this however it seems a sufficient answer that the former word is employed because Christian baptism is included in a more comprehensive category along with Levitical purifications.

The "laying on of hands" is to be understood in the light of the apostolic practice of imposing hands on the heads of baptized persons, as a sign of the communication of the Holy Ghost. This symbolic action was often followed by the bestowal of miraculous gifts. The doctrine probably consisted largely in explanations concerning these

the old to the new feel that they are what most need to be repented of, and that in deliverance from them Christ's redemptive power is most signally displayed. They constitute the "vain conversation received by tradition from the fathers" of which St. Peter speaks. The phrase "dead works" as used by our author seems to be a current expression rather than a coinage of his own, and we can easily imagine its origin in circles familiar with Christ's moral criticism of Pharisaism. Bleek is of opinion that "dead works" mean *legē* religious works.

gifts—tongues, prophesyings, etc.—just such instruction as we find in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians on the subject of spiritual gifts. The doctrine of the laying on of hands has ceased to hold a place among the Christian *principia*, because miraculous charisms have passed away.

Such are the fundamentals.¹ What now is meant by leaving them? Not of course ceasing to believe in them, or to think and speak of them, or to set importance on them; for the things enumerated, though elementary, are fundamental, as the term *θεμέλιον* implies. They are to be left in the sense in which a builder leaves the foundation of a house, by erecting an edifice thereon. They are not to be treated as if they were everything, building as well as foundation; as if all were done when the foundation was laid, and the builder might then fold his hands. Yet there has always been a Christianity of this sort, stationary, unprogressive, never getting beyond the initial stage, always concerned about repentance, pardon, peace, justification. With reference to Christian teachers the meaning is, that they are not to confine themselves to the elementary truths of the faith, but to go on to higher doctrine, teaching wisdom to the "perfect," the mature in spiritual understanding, not forgetful of their peculiar needs, though the number of them in the Church be small. Even for the sake of the

¹ In an interesting article in *THE EXPOSITOR* for December, 1888, by Rev. R. G. Balfour, M.A., a third way of connecting the six articles is proposed: that the second pair is to be regarded as a parenthetical remark concerning the first, to the effect that repentance was symbolically taught by washings, i.e. Levitical purifications, and faith by the laying on of hands (on the head of the victim in the great day of atonement). Mr. Balfour renders, "Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and faith exercised upon God (the things taught by washings, also by laying on of hands), also, the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment." Readers are referred to the article for his argument; but I may notice here his contention that *βαπτισμῶν διδασχῆς* can only mean the doctrine which washings teach, and that had the writer meant the doctrine concerning washings he would have written *περὶ β.δ.* But the genitive *βαπτισμῶν* may be either subjective or objective. For instances of the objective genitive see Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*.

immature it is well not to tarry too long by the elements, lest they imagine they have nothing more to learn, when in truth they are in the state of the disciples to whom Jesus said, "I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now."

What he has just declared to be desirable the writer intimates his own purpose to do, cherishing the desire, if not the hope, that he may carry his readers along with him. "And this will we do," you and I, "if, that is,¹ God permit." This "if God permit" is an ominous hint at the more than possibility of the Hebrews having become so spiritually hidebound that they will prove totally incapable of receiving new truth. And so it forms a suitable introduction to the solemn passage which follows. And yet, though when a grave, earnest man makes reference to God's sovereign will, we feel that he must have some serious thought in his mind, we are hardly prepared for the very sombre picture of the apostate which this passage contains. Nor is it quite easy to see how it is connected with what goes before. Does the writer mean, "It is useless to keep insisting on foundation truths relating to repentance, faith, and the like topics; for if any one have fallen away you cannot bring him to repentance by any amount of preaching on the old trite themes"? or is his meaning rather, "I do trust you and I will go on together to manhood and its proper food, though I have my fears concerning you, fears lest you be in the position of men who have lapsed from a bright initial experience, whose outlook for the future is necessarily very gloomy"? Possibly both of those thoughts were passing through his mind when he wrote.

In these verses (4-6) there is a vivid description of a happy past, a supposition made regarding those whose past experience is portrayed, and a strong assertion hazarded regarding any in whom that supposition is realized

¹ ἐδυνάμην, the *πρὸς* intensifying the force of the *ἐδύν.*

The description of initial Christian *experience* is a companion picture to the preceding account of initial Christian *instruction*. It points to an intense religious life, full of enthusiasm, joy, and spiritual elevation, not however to be regarded as the exceptional privilege of the few, but rather as the common inheritance of the Church in the apostolic age. The picture is painted in high colours, but the outlines are not very distinct; and the spectator, while powerfully impressed, fails to carry away a clear idea of the scene. The writer's purpose is not to give information to us, but to awaken in the breasts of his first readers sacred memories, and breed godly sorrow over a dead past. Hence he expresses himself in emotional terms such as might be used by recent converts rather than in the colder but more exact style of the historian. "The heavenly gift"—precious doubtless, but what is it? "The good word of God"—ineffably sweet, but what precise word gave such rare enjoyment? Five distinct elements in the initial Christian experience of converts seem to be specified, yet on further analysis they appear to be reducible to three: the *illumination* conveyed by elementary Christian instruction (*φωτισθέντας*), the *enjoyment* connected with that illumination (*γευσσάμενους*, ver. 4, repeated in ver. 5);¹ and the spiritual *power* communicated by the Holy Ghost, and manifesting itself in the miraculous charisms whereof we read in Acts and in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (*δυνάμεις*

¹ The repetition of *γευσσάμενους* suggests that the clause in which the participle occurs for the second time may be explanatory of that in which it occurs for the first time. In that case the "heavenly gift" would be practically identical with the "word of God," which the convert finds good to his taste = the gospel of grace; and the "Holy Spirit" in which the convert participates would be synonymous with the "powers of the world to come." That is to say, the Holy Spirit would be referred to, not as the indwelling source of Christian sanctity, but as the source of spiritual gifts or miraculous charisms. The change in the construction (the genitive after the participle in the first case, the accusative in the second) may suggest slightly differing shades of meaning: sharing, having part in the heavenly gift, appreciating the quality of the Divine word, receiving the truth, feeling its value.

μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, ver. 5): The cardinal fact is the illumination. The light of heaven breaking in on the soul awakens strong emotions, which find vent in speaking with tongues and prophesying—the powers and signs of the Messianic age. That illumination is the epoch-making event of the Christian life. It takes place once for all (ἅπαξ); there ought to be no need for its repetition, nay, it cannot be repeated. It comes like a revelation, and produces mighty effects; and woe to the man who lets the light go out!

“If they fall away” (καὶ παραπεσόντες), such is the supposition made with reference to persons who have gone through experiences so remarkable. The case put is that of persons who once knew, believed, and loved Christian truth, did wonderful works in Christ’s name and by the power of His Spirit, lapsing into ignorance, unbelief, indifference, or even dislike of what they once found sweet to their taste—God’s word and the gift of grace to which it bears witness. The very putting of such a case seems a rude contradiction of the dogma of perseverance, and hence this passage has been a famous battlefield between Arminians and Calvinists. The expositor who is more concerned about the correct interpretation of Scripture than about the defence of any system of theology will not find himself able to go altogether with either side in the controversy. The Bible is an excellent book for the purposes of practical religion, but rather a tantalising book for the scholastic theologian. Its writers know nothing of the caution and reserve of the system maker, but express themselves in strong, unqualified terms which are the torment of the dogmatist and the despair of the controversialist. The author of this epistle in particular writes, not as a theorist, but as an observer of facts. Cases of the kind described have actually come under his eye. He has seen many bearing all the marks of true believers fall away, and

he has observed that such men do not usually return to the faith from which they have lapsed. He speaks as his experience prompts. He does not call in question the reality of the faith and gracious affections of *quondam* Christians, but describes these after their fall, as he would have described them before it, admitting them to have been blossoms, though they were blighted by frost, or leaf-bearing branches, though they afterwards became dead and rotten.

As little, on the other hand, does he hesitate to affirm that recovery in such cases is impossible, reasoning again from past observation, and also doubtless in part from the nature of the case, apostates appearing to him like a fire whose fuel has been completely consumed so that nothing remains but *ashes*. This brings us to the third point in the passage before us,—the strong assertion made regarding those who lapse: “It is impossible to renew them again unto repentance.” Two questions suggest themselves. Is the assertion to be taken strictly? and, so taken, is it true? That the writer uses the word “impossible” strictly may be inferred from the reason he gives for his assertion. When men have got the length of crucifying Christ to themselves, and putting Him to an open shame before others, their case is hopeless.¹ But possibly he puts too severe a construction on the facts. There may be a lapse from the bright life of a former time, serious and perilous,

¹ Dr. Edwards takes the participles ἀναστραπούντας and παραδειγματίζοντας, not as explanatory of παραπεσύντας, but as putting a hypothetical case, and renders, “they cannot be renewed after falling away if they persist in crucifying.” The change from the aorist to the present may be in favour of this view, yet one cannot help feeling that the writer means to say something more serious than that falling away is fatal *when* it amounts to crucifying Christ. Mr. Rendall has another way of softening the severity of the dictum; viz. to take ἀνακαινίσκειν as expressing continuous action, and render “it is impossible to keep renewing”=the process of falling and renewing cannot go on indefinitely: the power of impression grows weaker, and at length becomes exhausted by repetition. This view is certainly in keeping with the spirit of the whole passage (v. 11-14, vi. 1-8).

but not amounting to a crucifying of Christ, or so hardening the heart as to make repentance impossible.

Now two things may be admitted here. First, there are phases of the spiritual life liable to be mistaken for symptoms of apostasy, which are truly interpreted only when looked at in the light of the great law of gradual growth enunciated by our Lord in the parable of the blade, the green ear, and the full corn in the ear.¹ The difficult problem of Christian experience cannot be mastered unless we grasp the truth taught in that parable, and know the characteristics of each stage, and especially of the second, which are most liable to be misunderstood. For lack of such knowledge many a Christian, destined to reach a splendid spiritual manhood, has seemed to himself and others to have fallen away utterly from grace, faith, and goodness, while he was simply passing through the stage of the green fruit, with all its unwelcome yet wholesome experiences. In this crude stage of his religious history Bunyan thought he had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, and "an ancient Christian," supposed to be wise in counsel, whom he consulted, told him he thought so too. Yet he was on the way to Beulah through the valley of the shadow of death; and few reach that blessed land without passing along the same dark, dreary road. How far the writer of our epistle, or indeed any of the New Testament writers, understood the law of growth by broadly discriminated stages, enunciated by Christ, does not appear. It is certain that nowhere else in the New Testament can there be found a statement approaching in scientific clearness and distinctness to that contained in the parable referred to.² In absence of a

¹ Mark iv. 26-29. On this parable see *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*.

² It has been disputed whether there be any distinct doctrine of growth or gradual sanctification in Paul's epistles. Pfeiderer maintains the affirmative. Reuss, a more orthodox theologian, denies, maintaining that Paul conceives the new life as perfect from the first. There is a noticeable difference between Paul and our Lord in their respective manner of dealing with the defects of young

theory of sanctification to guide them, however, their spiritual sagacity might be trusted to keep them from confounding a case like Bunyan's with that of an apostate.

Second. Bible writers often state in unqualified terms as an absolute truth what is in reality only an affair of tendency. Translated into a statement of tendency, the doctrine taught is this. Every fall involves a risk of apostasy, and the higher the experience fallen from the greater the risk. The deeper religion has gone into a man at the commencement of his Christian course, the less hopeful his condition if he lapse. The nearer the initial stage to a thorough conversion the less likely is a second change, if the first turn out abortive; and so on, in ever-increasing degrees of improbability as lapses increase in number. The brighter the light in the soul, the deeper the darkness when the light is put out. The sweeter the manna of God's word to the taste, the more loathsome it becomes when it has lost its relish. The fiercer the fire in the hearth while the fuel lasts, the more certain it is that when the fire goes out there will remain nothing but ashes. The livelier the hope of glory, the greater the aversion to all thoughts of the world to come when once a Christian has, like Atheist in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, turned his back on the heavenly Jerusalem. Action and reaction are equal. The more forcibly you throw an elastic ball against a wall the greater the rebound; in like manner the more powerfully the human spirit is brought under celestial influences, the greater the recoil from all good, if there be a recoil at all. The gushing enthusiasts of to-day are the cynical sceptics of to-morrow. Have promoters of "revivals" laid these things duly to heart?

Christians. Paul blames, as if they were full grown men; Christ corrects, as one who knows that nothing else is to be looked for in children, and that the future will bring wisdom: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

But the wise teacher whose complaint of his dull scholars we are considering has something more serious in view, when he speaks of falling away, than the coldness and languor, or even the moral lapses, which are apt to overtake converts after a period of great excitement. It is not a question of loss of feeling, or of unstable, inconsistent conduct, or of falls through infirmity, but of deep alienation of heart. He thinks of such as are capable of cherishing towards Christ the feelings of hatred which animated the men who crucified Him, and of openly renouncing the Christian faith. This was the crime the Hebrew Christians were tempted to commit. A fatal step it must be when taken; for men who left the Christian Church and went back to the synagogue became companions of persons who thought they did God service in cursing the name of Jesus.

The writer proceeds (vers. 7, 8), by a comparison drawn from agriculture, to illustrate the danger to which those are exposed who, having had a pronounced spiritual experience, afterwards fall away from the faith and life of the gospel. The parable does not really afford us much help to the understanding of the matter; as it is rendered in the Authorized Version it affords no help at all. As the case is put there, a contrast seems to be drawn between two kinds of soil, one of which is well watered, and therefore fertile, while the other is unwatered, and therefore sterile or productive only of thorns and thistles. Such a contrast would bring out the difference between those who have and those who have not enjoyed gospel privileges, not the difference between two classes of Christians who have both equally enjoyed such privileges, or the two possible alternatives in the case of every professing Christian. It is a contrast fitted to serve the latter purpose that really is made. Exactly rendered it runs thus: "For land which, after drinking in the rain that cometh oft upon it, bringeth forth herbage meet for those for whose benefit it is tilled,

receiveth blessing from God; but if *it* (the same land well watered) bear thorns and thistles, it is worthless, and nigh unto a curse, whose end is unto burning."

When we compare this parable with any of our Lord's, there is a great falling off in point of felicity and instructiveness. One purpose it doubtless serves, to make clear the matter of fact, that the same Christian privileges and experiences may issue in widely different ultimate results. The soil is supposed in either case to be well watered, not only rained upon, but often saturated with water, having drunk up the blessing of the clouds, and moreover to be carefully tilled; for though that point is left in the background, it is alluded to in the words δι' οὗς καὶ γεωργεῖται. Yet in one case it yields a useful crop, in the other only a useless crop of thorns and thistles. But why? On this important question the parable throws no light. The land which bears the useless crop is not a barren rock; for it drinks in the rain, and it is considered worth ploughing. Nay, it is doubtful if the case supposed in the second alternative can occur in the natural world. Was there ever a land well tilled and watered that produced nothing but thorns and thistles? It seems as if the natural and the spiritual were mixed up here, and that were said of the one which is strictly true only with reference to the other. The writer describes a case in the natural world which can hardly happen to represent a case which may happen in the spiritual world, that, *viz.*, of men whose hearts have been sown with the seed of truth and watered with the rain of grace becoming so utterly degenerate and reprobate, as in the end to produce nothing but the thorns and thistles of unbelief and ungodliness.¹ Mixture of metaphor and

¹ Natural improbability occurs in some of our Lord's parables; *e.g.*, in the parable of the great supper. Such a thing as all the guests invited to a feast with one consent refusing to come does not happen in society. The truth is, it is impossible to describe the essentially unreasonable behaviour of men in regard to the kingdom of God in parabolic language, without violating natural

literal sense is indeed manifest throughout, the phrases "receiveth blessing," "reprobate" (*ἀδίκιμος*), "nigh to a curse," "whose end is unto burning," expressing moral ideas rather than physical facts. This is particularly evident in the case of the last phrase. It plainly points to a judicial visitation of the severest kind, the appointed penalty of spiritual unfruitfulness. But in the natural sphere burning is remedial rather than punitive, to burn land which has become foul being a good method of restoring it to fertility.

In yet another respect the comparison fails us. Supposing there were such a thing as burning unprofitable land by way of judicial visitation, as the land of Sodom was destroyed by fire and brimstone—an event which may have been present to the writer's thoughts,—the fact might serve to symbolize the Divine judgment on apostasy. But the matter on which we most of all need light is the asserted impossibility of renewal. That the finally impenitent should be punished we understand, but what we want to know is, how men get into that state: what is the psychological history of irreconcilable apostasy? To refer to Divine agency in hardening human hearts does not help us, for God hardens by means naturally fitted and intended to soften and win. Neither can we take refuge in the supposition of insufficient initial grace, at least from the point of view of the writer of our epistle; for he assumes that the fruitful and the unfruitful have been equally favoured. The rain falls not less liberally on the land that bears thorns and thistles than on the land that brings forth an abundant crop of grass or grain; and the rain represents the enlightenment, enjoyment, and power previously mentioned.

In the parable of the sower the diversity in the results is traced to the nature of the soil. In each case the issue is probability. On the other hand, the parables which describe Christ's own conduct, much assailed by His contemporaries, are all thoroughly true to nature; e.g., those in the fifteenth chapter of Luke. I have remarked on this contrast in *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*.

exactly such as we should expect from the character of the ground. In the parable before us opposite results are supposed to be possible in the same soil. That is to say, the effect is conceived to depend on the will of each individual, on the use one makes of his privileges. The Hebrew Christians might have been teachers, instead of childish learners, had they chosen to take the necessary pains; they might have been full grown men, had they only properly exercised their spiritual senses in discerning between good and evil.

A. B. BRUCE.

THE APOSTLES.

III. THE MINOR FIGURES.

How does Art contrive to define and quicken into life those minor characters upon whom she cannot bestow a large space or many touches? To one method, only too simple and obvious, many even among distinguished authors have been driven: the fixing a sort of label upon these personages, by which they may be known again. The fat boy in Dickens is always dropping asleep, and Mr. Buckett shaking his finger: Robespierre in Carlyle is always sea-green, and Buonaparte always bronze.

In greater writers than these we have not this repetition of one mannerism, or insistence upon one physical peculiarity, but in the place of a human being we too often find the incarnation of a quality. In Ben Jonson the minor characters are not boastful or boorish, self-indulgent or servile men, they are boastfulness or stupidity, luxury or adulation, dressed up as puppets and bidden to speak. Nay, even the supreme dramatic power of Shakespeare may, with a little attention, be caught in the workshop, and its methods detected by a study of his minor parts.

Speed is not very characteristic, except when he quibbles. Marcellus has no individuality, except so far as he forbodes public mischief (catching up this clue from Horatio), and when first discussing the apparition wants to know, "Why such daily cast of brazen cannon?" and again thinks, when the ghost reappears, that "something is rotten in the state of Denmark." Most readers can see the wires which move the clowns and pedants; and liveliness is given to the maidens in several plays by the device of making them copy closely the wiles and coquetries of their mistresses, thus reduplicating the effect which has already been elaborated.

Such things show that genius itself cannot easily vivify a character in a few strokes. And we must remember that the dramatist and the novelist have a great advantage, because they mould their incidents with a view to the unfolding and artificial display of human nature, while the historian must follow the actual course of events.

The gospel history has proved its fidelity in a remarkable way. For it has not condescended to gratify men's innocent curiosity by relating the slightest incident concerning many of the apostolic group.

It is a familiar evidence of the faith, that the Scripture is often most explicit where "the mind of the flesh" has no desire to learn, and at times most silent where men are so inquisitive as to imagine the answer which has been withheld from us.

The spurious gospels, with their wild accounts of the education of the Virgin, the childhood of Jesus, and the descent into hell, are well known specimens of the lines along which Scripture would have been impelled, if the motive power had been human curiosity and not Divine inspiration, if the gospel had been invented as an anodyne for the cravings of the intellect, and not given as bread for the hunger of the soul. And the same superhuman silence rebukes us, when we ask what supreme greatness it was, of service or of wisdom, which engraved on the foundation stones of the heavenly Jerusalem some of the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.

Concerning Simon the Cananæan, we only know what that name, and St. Luke's translation of it, tell us. He had been a Zealot. For a moment at least he had been drawn to that wild and unscrupulous movement which at last shook down his country. Was it while yet in the fever of such excited energies that he saw the wondrous works of Jesus, did homage to the zeal of God's house which ate Him up (John ii. 17, R.V.), and

SIMON
ZELOTES.

thenceforce yielded his soul to be gradually transformed by the milder ardours of the Christian faith? Or was it in some hour of sad reaction against the violence and guilt of his faction that he was drawn to the gentler Physician of bleeding souls, as one looks up, with aching eyes, from the glare of a conflagration to the silver light of heaven?

We know not; nor is any effort whatever made to fix our attention upon the fact, of more profound significance than perhaps the evangelists themselves were conscious, that the wild zeal of Simon was called into such close communion with the Lamb of God. Jesus never indicated more clearly that His Church was to embrace all phases and temperaments of human nature, and that He was Himself the Son of man, the Child of universal humanity, who could sympathise with high aspiring, even when it was ill-regulated and mistaken, with zeal toward God though not according to knowledge, than when He, the meek and lowly of heart, who should not strive, nor cry, nor lift up His voice in the streets, chose for one of His immediate followers the Zealot. Neither is any comment made upon the scorn of mere prudence which enrolled a follower so sure to be suspected. That it was so is recorded: the conclusion we are left to draw for ourselves. Nor do we read anything of the gallant labours by which Simon doubtless justified the choice. As he comes, so he passes away, in silence. We only know of him, because we know it of all, that he praised God when his Lord ascended, awaited the Comforter in the upper room, rejoiced when they were accounted worthy to suffer dishonour for the Name (Acts v. 41), and bore his part in the planting of the sacred seed in the broad field of the world. Yet there is no more tempting subject for legend or romance to work upon than the deeds of the Zealot in the cause of Jesus. But possibly his methods, however effective, were not the best to put on

record for the meditations of the Church. Beyond doubt they were outshone by the achievements of that other who was called, while breathing out threats and slaughters, to bear the name of Jesus to remote nations and to kings.

And thus, edification not requiring the record, not a solitary act or word of Simon Zelotes is preserved to us. It suffices him that his name is written in the one lasting roll of fame, the book of life.

We are in almost equal ignorance concerning James the Little in stature, miscalled James the Less. We do not certainly know that he was a different person JAMES THE LITTLE. from the brother of the Lord, although it will never be the opinion of unsophisticated readers that if one brother (or two, for Jude must follow the same ruling) were already among the Twelve, and had shared in the great confession of St. Peter, "Thou art . . . the Son of the living God," St. John could have written that, in the last period of Christ's ministry, "even His brethren did not believe on Him" (vii. 5).¹

No careful reader can be misled by the Authorized Version of Galatians i. 19, nor would this rendering itself establish the conclusion which has been drawn from it (*cf.* Lightfoot *in loc.*). And if it be objected that three persons of one name could scarcely have held prominent positions in the Church, we may well ask in reply whether it was the son of Zebedee, or the brother of Jesus and bishop of Jerusalem, who needed to be distinguished by the singular title James the Small.

Thus we are led to the conclusion that we have a second Apostle, concerning whose words or deeds not an echo of fame has reached us.

¹ The answer of Lange is surely enough to put his case out of court. "The brethren of Jesus, though still, when viewed in the light of the subsequent pentecostal season, unbelieving, *i.e.* self-willed and gloomy, could nevertheless be apostles" (*Life*, i., 336).

Nor does it appear, at first sight, that the case of Bartholomew is any clearer. His very name is uncertain, Bar-tholomew being only the son of Tolmai, BARTHOLOMEW. as Bartimæus is the son of Timæus. But an ingenious conjecture throws some light, though flickering and uncertain, upon the subject. The group of fishers in the closing narrative of St. John consists entirely of apostles, unless Nathanael be an exception (xxi. 2). But Nathanael was previously mentioned in the story of the calling of the first and greatest of the apostles, and there we read that he was found by Philip. Now it is pointed out, that the three catalogues in the synoptical gospels all join the name of Bartholomew with this same Philip. It is therefore a reasonable conjecture, so long as we remember that it is a surmise and no more, which makes Nathanael the son of Tolmai.

And this brings within our scope an incident delicately drawn. When a Nazarene is announced to Nathanael as the Messiah, local prejudice and the unfitness of such a hamlet for such honour make him dubious. And when Jesus pronounces him an Israelite indeed, because guileless, and therefore worthy of the better name of him who was at first a supplanter, he is still cautious, and asks, "Whence knowest Thou me?" And yet, in this question, the character given to him is justified. For he does not feel it to be misplaced: no hidden dishonesty causes the saying to jar upon his consciousness; rather, he asks how it comes to pass that he is known so well. And when Jesus answers by indicating some secret of his inner life, his guileless nature no longer hesitates to confess Him largely and amply, and the true Israelite does homage to his King: "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God" (whom the Baptist thus describes, ver. 34), "Thou art the King of Israel."

How often has our curiosity asked what it was that

Jesus saw beneath the fig tree, what temptation conquered, what good deed performed, what passionate prayer of the genuine Israelite for his forsaken land? But the tact of Jesus betrayed not what the simplicity of Nathanael would fain conceal. The Lord proceeds to stimulate his hope by a promise of greater things, in which all the group should have a part,¹ such a reunion of heaven and earth as was revealed to Jacob, ere yet his guile was burned out of him in the fire of affliction, the coming and going of angels as upon a ladder upon Him whom His disciples confessed to be the Son of God, but who loved to call Himself the Son of man (John i. 45-51).

The graceful reticence of Jesus with regard to Nathanael's innocent secret; the coyness of the intellect and the alacrity of the heart of the new disciple, and the title he gives his King, which virtually says, "If I be an Israelite, my fealty is Thine"; the reward promised to his faith, which is not a personal gain, but an ampler revelation; and the repeated allusion to the history of the patriarch,—all contribute to the effect of this sunny and delightful incident. And yet all we read afterwards of Nathanael is that he went a-fishing with Peter. And except by this conjecture we know absolutely nothing of the Apostle Bartholomew. So far is Scripture from idealizing even its greatest names.

One certain incident only brings Jude into a clearer light, since the same arguments which apply to James the Little show that he too was not the brother of our Lord, the author of the Epistle of Jude.

JUDE.

From his position in the lists, we may be sure that he is the Lebbæus of St. Matthew and the Thaddæus of St. Mark; and perhaps these names were used, like the additions of the epithet, "brother (or son) of James," to separate him clearly from the infamy of his terrible namesake.

¹ "Believest thou? . . . ye shall see."

What we read of him is one thoughtful question, met by a full and deeply spiritual answer. "Lord, what is come to pass that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" To Jude we owe the great exposition how love leads to obedience, and attracts in return the Divine love which leads to manifestation; while they who love not Christ cannot keep His words (John xiv. 22-24).

Reassured then by the utter absence of all "tendency" from the narrative, which seeks not to create a wonderful career, nor spiritual achievement, nor intellectual distinction for the chosen ones, we return to those minor personages in the group of whom some few incidents are recorded. Putting these incidents together, we ask whether they indicate real character, life, individuality; and if so, whether there is any trace of artifice or self-consciousness in the indications.

Foremost in order and perhaps in interest is Andrew, the brother of the strong and impetuous Peter,
ANDREW. and sharer of the family temperament.

When he, with another, hears the Baptist's testimony, they promptly follow Jesus, who is hitherto unattended, and has apparently come back from the temptation to make a silent claim on His forerunner for the first elements out of which He will mould His Church. It was not for mortal to accost Jesus before He had begun His public work of grace. But when He asks, "What seek ye?" the answer is direct and brief: "Rabbi, where dwellest Thou?" From the lowly home of Jesus Andrew goes to Peter with the short and sharp utterance of an eager man who has no misgivings, "We have found the Messiah," so unlike the weighed and slow declaration of the same fact by Philip, who took seventeen words to announce what Andrew said in three. And here again the reticence must be observed which tells us nothing of the surprise of the two friends, confronted by a Messiah so unlike the national hope, in a

dwelling so unlike their dreams, nor anything of the earliest, wonderful discourse which sent forth Andrew, with his soul on fire, the first convert that ever led another to his Lord, and that other, the Peter of the keys. Does any one doubt that legend would have reversed the positions of Simon and Andrew in this narrative? ¹

When Jesus called the two brothers from their nets, Andrew was no less prompt than Simon to obey: "They straightway left the nets, and followed Him" (Matt. iv. 20).

In the miracle of the five thousand, when the disciples were bidden to see what provision was forthcoming, Andrew discovered the lad with the loaves and fishes; and St. John, who only has preserved this detail, so tells it as to suggest a suspicion that there was already some lurking hope of what should follow, the information being apparently ready, and Andrew's suggestive mention of this little store being contrasted with Philip's unenterprising calculation (John vi. 7, 8).

Still more characteristic is the story of the application of certain Greeks to the Apostle with a Greek name. Philip hesitates, knows not what to do; but the difficulty vanishes the moment that Andrew, as a helpful person, is consulted: Philip and Andrew went and told Jesus (John xii. 22). This is in exact harmony with all that we know of both; yet so undesigned and subtle is the coincidence, that even Dean Alford has overlooked it, and transposed the parts they play. "When certain Greeks wished for an interview with Jesus, they applied through Andrew, who consulted Philip," etc. (Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, Art. Andrew). It may safely be asserted that Andrew would have done nothing of the kind.

¹ Renan can of course explain the part they take by the simple theory that St. John was jealous of Peter, and sought to put him in a secondary place, even in this matter (*Vie*, p. lxvi., note 2; 15th edition). But most sceptics would find their positions gravely compromised indeed, if they brought back the Gospel of St. John so far as this unamiable theory demands.

Once more, when the three who formed an inner circle desired to ask a question of pre-eminent importance, when should the temple be destroyed, and what should be the sign, they associated Andrew with them in asking Jesus "privately" (Mark xiii. 3). All this is consistent, lucid, and natural: let us see how it agrees with the conduct of others.

We have already twice glanced at the contrast between the decision of Andrew and the greater deliberation of

PHILIP.

Philip. A slow, and even hesitating circumspection is the distinctive peculiarity of this disciple. At the very outset he needs a direct impulse from the supreme Will; he is the first whom Jesus claims, and as it were seizes, saying, "Follow Me." In Smith's *Dictionary* he is described as repeating to Nathanael "the self-same words with which Andrew had brought to Peter the good news that the Christ had at last appeared." But the difference is far more significant than the likeness, and none would fail to distinguish the words of the brother of Peter, if shown for the first time the two sentences, one so concentrated, the other so cautious, so cumulative in its slow disclosure, so diplomatic in reserving to the very last the dangerous word which did actually startle his hearers. One said, "We have found the Christ": the other, "Him whom Moses wrote of in the law, and the prophets, we have found, Jesus the son of Joseph, Him of Nazareth." And when Nathanael questions further, Philip returns the unemotional, discreet answer, "Come and see" (John i. 43-47). It was to Philip, and specially to prove him, that Jesus put the question, "Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?" And with his natural grave circumspection Philip calculates the sum necessary to give each of them a little (John vi. 5-7).

We have already seen him needing the advice of Andrew before venturing to tell Jesus of the application of the

Greeks (John xii. 20-22). And when Jesus declares that from henceforth His disciples know, and have seen the Father, Philip suddenly discloses a desire for more tangible evidence than even that of the voice which lately came, for their sakes, who needed it, from heaven. There is care, misgiving, the accent of a troubled heart in his answer, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us"; if we had seen Him these brooding anxieties would be at rest (John xiv. 8).

In him a different type of character finds a place among the Twelve, and even a place of honour; for the slow and cautious heart is often most loyal at the core. Philip is leader of the second of those three groups of four Apostles, into which we have seen that the Twelve are sub-divided.

Yet one cannot but feel that Clement of Alexandria has either preserved a fact, or else indicated, perhaps unconsciously, a striking resemblance of character, when he quotes the words as addressed to Philip, "Let the dead bury their dead, but thou follow Me." Was he not the very man to plead, "Suffer me first to go and bury my father"?

From Philip to Thomas is but one step, and that in the same direction; but the advance is real, and the characteristics, though similar, are discriminated as accurately as the melancholy of Jacques from THOMAS. that of Hamlet. Philip hesitates and considers, Thomas despairs. He is in sore danger of falling, and the hour will come when he must either conquer his besetment or perish. Yet he is kept by the fire of real love, which gleams through all the smoke of his despondency. For he is loyal when most hopeless, and his character is perfectly shown in the first event that is recorded of him. When Jesus would return to Judæa, where the Jews had lately sought to kill Him, and added to some obscure sayings about Lazarus the plain words, "Lazarus is dead, . . .

let us go unto him," Thomas readily inferred the worst. All was over now; nothing was left but either to forsake his Master or to share His fate. And yet the faithful heart conquered the gloomy temperament, and he said, with no parade of loyalty, not addressing Jesus Himself, but his comrades, Let us be true to the end; "let us also go, that we may die with Him" (John xi. 16). It is a saying which deserves the notice of those shallow critics who find only boastfulness in the professions of the last supper.

The same helplessness (brooding no doubt upon the solemn warnings which intervened, but unable to accept these with their stated limitations, and with the promise of ultimate triumph which accompanied them every one) reappears in the second incident recorded. It was when Jesus said, "Whither I go, ye know the way," that he seized the opportunity to confess his perplexities in the discouraging and despairing comment, "Lord, we know not whither Thou goest: how know we the way?" (John xiv. 5.) He speaks for his brethren as well as himself; but Thomas was their spokesman in despair, as naturally as Peter in the confession of their faith.

Such joyless temperaments are given to solitude.¹ We know too little to rely upon the absence of any conjunction of another name with his, but there is much significance in the fact that he was not with the disciples when they solemnly assembled, with due precautions, in the evening of the resurrection day (John xx. 24). In what seclusion had he buried his woes, that all day long no rumour of the return of hope had reached him? Or in what obstinate despair had he repelled the tidings, and held aloof from the

¹ Jacques and Hamlet have just been mentioned. The former in his affectation of melancholy, says, "I thank you for your company; but, good faith, I had as lief have been myself alone." And the latter says, "Man delights not me, nor woman neither."

assembly, whose agitation and suspense would irritate his settled gloom? Accordingly no vision but his own will convince him; and even this he does not think enough, for it is not the sincerity of his comrades that he doubts, he would equally refuse the same evidence exhibited to himself. Such is the utter despair of love in its defeat, a love which broods over the list of the cruel wounds that have bereaved it, and requires to verify them all. And yet some unconscious hope relieved the darkness of the long week which followed, for he was not absent when Jesus reappeared.

This was the crisis of his life, when his character will be fixed, and he must either "become" faithless or believing (*μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστός*). And his glad avowal, for it is more than a cry, tells us that the victory is won. Thou art "my Lord and my God" (for *Ὁ Κύριός μου* is a confession; an exclamation would have been *Κύριε*).

We are surely entitled to claim these three various incidents as a revelation of consistent character, more perfect than any which the students of Shakespeare have found wrought upon as small a canvas.

Of the minor Apostles, only Matthew is left. And here the study is complicated, because we know more of his true nature from the character of his gospel (the authenticity of which is here assumed, as well MATTHEW. as the obvious identity of Matthew and Levi), than from what is told us directly of him. Something however is recorded, and we can compare the two sources of information.

From the fact that he had been a publican, we may infer that his feelings, if strong, would be silent and repressed, as are those of all whose position is equivocal and ill thought of. When Jesus called, "he left all"; but it is not he himself who joins this statement to the words "he rose and followed Him," nor who records the fact that

he made for Jesus "a great feast in his own house"¹ (Luke v. 28, 29). St. Matthew's expression was both unostentatious and natural from the man himself, "as Jesus sat at meat *in the house*" (Matt. ix. 10). Here, because they saw the acceptance of a publican, many publicans and sinners sat at meat with Him, and his gospel, which is accused of a specially Hebrew tone and of Old Testament sympathies, records that His discourse was of the futility of patching old garments, and putting new wine into old skins.

And this is all we know of him, except one striking inference. Although he was apparently the only man of business among the Twelve, and should naturally have been the treasurer, yet he was either content to yield the post to Judas, or submissive when supplanted by him.

Trained in the somewhat mechanical duties of an officer of customs, and repressed besides by the evil reputation of his calling, silent about his large hospitality, but careful to record his shame, and willing to stand aside when another would push before him, what sort of gospel should we expect from Matthew? His writing should exhibit order, an interest in numbers, a business-like attention to detail, accuracy rather than boldness or a fiery reproduction of passionate and striking scenes; and yet under all this the strong, deep feeling of the man who never forgot that the King of the Jews had called the toll-gatherer of the Roman to His side. Nor is it wonderful that his gospel should be the most Hebrew of the four, and more than the others careful to trace in the story of Christ all the fibres of connexion with that ancient system which his former calling had somewhat slighted.

And this is exactly what we find. At the beginning, he so arranges the genealogy that there shall be three sections,

¹ He alone, in the list of Apostles, adds to his own name the epithet of shame, "the publican."

each of fourteen persons, so that the Messiah comes in the seventh place after six sevens. It is from him alone that we learn that a second demoniac was healed at Gerasa, and a second blind man in Jericho (Matt. i. 17, viii. 27, xx. 30). And these two parallel cases entirely turn the edge of the somewhat clumsy railleries of Strauss, because Matthew alone mentions also that in the triumphal entry the ass accompanied her foal. It is in his manner thus to particularize, as if he were entering an account; it is not in that of either Mark or Luke.

If any one doubts the comparative absence of graphic and vivid delineation, he need only compare the three accounts of the fierceness and the cleansing of the demoniac (Matt. viii. 28, Mark v. 1, Luke viii. 26), or the two reports of that noble peroration, the falling of the house built upon sand, and the stability of the other which was built upon a rock (Matt. vii. 24, Luke vi. 47).

Yet when he comes to relate the suffering, the death, and the awful consequences of the death of his Master, it is this evangelist, elsewhere so calm and self-restrained, who rises to an epic grandeur and overwhelming energy, nor is anything in any other gospel even comparable to this astonishing narrative.

The four gospels have now been subjected to an elaborate and exhaustive cross-examination. Not one incident that is related of the more obscure Apostles, by which the slightest insight into character could be obtained, has been (consciously, at all events) passed over. And what have we found? Not a vestige of straining after effect, not the least desire to exhibit one of them as a hero or even as a saint, but human nature in all its varied phases, energetic, fearful, despondent, business-like, always vivid, consistent, lifelike.

Either the evangelists possessed a graphic and imagi-

native power equal to that of the greatest genius in all literature, enabling them, not once or twice, in three or four touches to create a distinct individual man, which power however they wielded quite unconsciously in the service of religion and not of art, or else they drew from life. One of these alternatives the sceptic is bound to choose. And when doing so, he must observe that he is dealing with one more strange phenomenon, in addition to so many others, a testimony of a different kind, reinforcing from an unexpected quarter the witness of history, of the Church, of the supernatural morality and the quickening spiritual power of Christianity, and above all, of the sublime and unearthly conception of Him who stands in the midst of this homely group, God manifested among these men of the people.

G. A. CHADWICK.

THE IMAGE AND THE STONE.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR! At that dread name how terrible a form rises from its ancient grave! The mighty conqueror of the antique eastern world stands before us illumined by three brief but vivid flashes of Scripture history; otherwise he would be but a name. He built Babylon, adorned and fortified it so as to be the wonder of its time—of all time, as historians and travellers tell of its vastness and record its splendour; nevertheless the builder of Babylon would be of small interest to us had he not destroyed Jerusalem, that little hill city! Three times he laid his hands upon it, twice besieged it, again and again carried into captivity its kings, its princes, its priests. Some perished early on the dismal journey, slain before the stern conqueror at Riblah, slain before the eyes of the last Hebrew king, ere those

eyes were quenched for ever. It is a fearful story. To the custody of such a man the sacred people are consigned ; but their sacredness immediately enwraps him as with a sacred vesture. He has received from heaven that high guardianship ; he becomes forthwith God's minister. The Most High casts over him the shield of the Divine protection ; nay, more, He visits him with visions of the night. To Nebuchadnezzar is revealed in a dream, and in its interpretation, the future of the world—the coming of the kingdom of Heaven !

Let us look at the story as it has come to us. The great king dreams, but he wakes with the terror of a vision that he cannot recall. He rages at his inability. He rages all the more that the accredited revealers of secrets, with all their costly paraphernalia of divination, cannot help him. They shall not put him off with any subterfuge. They shall die. If, as they say, none can show the thing except the gods, whose dwelling is “not with flesh,” why, is it not their business to consult such powers ? For what other purpose are they there but to deal with the occult, the mysterious, the awfulness above and around,—with those, whoever they are, whose dwelling indeed is “not with flesh,” but whom their incantations should be able to reach and to compel ? A suspicion of falsity, of long-sustained imposition, breaks upon his mind, and drives him to fury.

But there has been sent to dwell within his palace walls one of the greatest heroes of the Hebrew faith, one destined to be from time to time the organ of Divine communication with this greatest of earthly potentates. Now for the first time, the captive Daniel, involved with his companions in the fate of the soothsayers, steps forward and asks for delay, purposing to appeal to One—the God of heaven, supreme as heaven itself—concerning this secret. Again it is night, again appears the vision, not now to Nebuchadnezzar, but to Daniel ; and with the vision the interpretation thereof

is made clear to his understanding. Brought before the king, he excuses the magicians among whom he has been enrolled, whose gods have failed them, but declares that "there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and hath made known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days." "But as for me," he says, in effect, I am no diviner; "this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have more than any living." Let these others go. The interpretation is only given to me, "that thou mayest know the thoughts of thy heart."

"Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great Image!" But we need not repeat the well-known description of the colossal Image, strange and terrible, that stood in dazzling brightness before the dreaming king. The head of fine gold, the breast and arms of silver, the belly and thighs of brass, the legs of iron, the feet of iron and clay, are familiar to us. Nor need we dwell upon the interpretation given, that these separate parts represented kingdoms—empires that were to rule in succession upon the earth. Enough to remark that we have the authority of the original interpreter for recognising in the first of them the sovereignty of Nebuchadnezzar himself, "Thou art this head of gold," and that the second was that which should follow after him, unnamed, as are all the others. The particular identification of these is not to our purpose, though we may suppose that in the qualities of the different metals—as indeed we are told with respect to one of them, the iron—and also in the different portions of the body to which they are assigned, are suggested certain characteristics of the successive empires, affording a clue not very difficult to follow, to their verification in history. Our present object is to direct attention to this composite image as a whole, to what may be a symbolic rather than a definite historical meaning; to take it as representing worldly power in its various forms, all of them expressly the result of human wisdom, skill, and

energy ; to note too the method of its destruction, and the nature of that which took its place.

The great Image then, as it dazed the vision of Nebuchadnezzar, shone one gigantic figure of a man. What was the expression of the countenance we are not told ; most likely it showed only emotionless repose, features without expression, symbolizing simply power, passive, immovable, remorseless—power that answers no questions, and demands only silent, unquestioning submission. Possibly, after the Assyrian manner, the Image stood in profile, one arm stretched forth, one leg advanced ; and thus, fixing no gaze upon the beholder, remained the more inscrutable. It was entirely to outward view metallic, excepting the toes of brittle clay ; and the metals, whether gold, or silver, or brass, or iron, are all, we may remember, products of human labour and skill. They none of them exist otherwise ; the furnace and the alloy are required to fit them for human use. So much for the materials. But not only are these of human discovery and manufacture, but for an Image like that of the vision would be required the fashioning and fitting of each metal to its appointed place and function. The gold would need casting, or else beating into plates, or to be prepared for gilding the enormous head. The silver in like manner plated, or was wrought into semblance of arms and breast. Burnished brass built up the belly, and cuissed the thighs. Iron sheathed the legs, and was wrought partly into the feet that sustained the whole.

Thus it stood a thing of human contrivance from head to foot ; even where metal failed, and potter's clay supplied its place, there was the modelling of toes. The whole was fashioned to represent the organic unity of a human frame, all its parts were there. Part by part, whatever was the diversity of material, was adjusted to its place, so that the man-form should be complete—a figure that, were it living, could think and act could strike, and march to its end. It

was a figure of colossal, unassailable strength, but for one element of weakness scarcely observable amidst its signs of power—the one flaw attaching to those insignificant members the toes. Yet this Image with its grandeur, splendour, and strength of material, has to be destroyed. How shall destruction come? Shall axe or hammer come forth against it? Shall heaven's lightning blast it? Shall an earthquake shake it down?

By far other means. From a mountain side a Stone is loosened; stirred by no visible means, cut from the soil without hands, it begins to roll, and as it descends the steep it bounds and leaps towards the steadfast Image. Shall it strike the head of gold? Shall it assail the silver breastplate? No; it simply drops upon the feet, inconspicuous compared with the lofty bulk above—the feet wherein is the fatal flaw. They crumble with the blow, and then all fails. When the feet of iron and clay are crushed, the legs, despite their iron strength, bear up no longer. The body bows, the glorious head rolls in the dust, the whole lies in hideous ruin, and the winds arising sweep it all away.

Between the Stone and the Image there is a notable contrast. We have pointed out the artificial character of the Image, an object of human manufacture; the Stone is a natural product. No mason's tool has touched it. It is of no recognisable or definite shape, such as human intelligence would have given. Age-long elemental powers have moulded and placed it on the precipitous steep above. The processes have been altogether secret, silent, by which it has been formed, and reached its destined size and place. The cause of its descent at last is not observable. What it does, if it destroyed a human life, would, in legal phrase, be called "the act of God." Then the Stone, its work accomplished, takes the place of the destroyed statue, whose very fragments are to disappear, and, unlike the Image in its

lifeless immobility, notwithstanding its man-like form, the Stone seems to have life in itself; it grows, it enlarges its base, it towers in height, till it fills the whole horizon of the sleeper's sight.

This Stone which becomes a mountain receives, like the Image, its interpretation. As the Image represented human empire in a succession of kingdoms, so the Stone represents a kingdom, following upon, though in a measure contemporaneous with, the others. It is a kingdom which the God of heaven will set up, and which destroys the others. For it may be noticed that the earlier kingdoms, though according to the interpretation of the vision they had in turn passed away, are yet included in the destruction finally dealt upon the Image, suggesting to us a larger understanding of the vision than we might at first suppose. The Image after all is one, though of diverse parts, and of intermediate application, as the Stone is one, though it becomes a mountain.

The Stone, small as it is when it first comes to sight, is indeed that everlasting kingdom of God which in these latter days has been revealed. It is that kingdom which, coming not with observation,—as none would have noticed the Stone on the mountain side,—issuing from the secret, the eternal counsels of God, declares itself not in the glory of its power, but as a simple, unsuspected force. It is clad in no panoply of war. No catapult is required to launch the Stone, its momentum arises from the invisible action of a natural law. So the Divine kingdom makes no obvious assault, it uses no visible weapon; even the Stone does not encounter the kingdoms of this world where they affront the sky, but with that economy of means and yet completeness of result which marks the Divine administration, it strikes upon the one weak spot in its adversary, that one strange flaw in the mighty Image. That flaw may have an historical and temporary import, as the narrative appears to intimate;

but larger meanings are common in Divine prophecy, and looking at the Image as a whole, may we not take this flaw to indicate some inherent, invariable defect in all worldly power? If so, does not the "iron mixed with miry clay" aptly represent that moral corruption through which the pomp and pride and military strength of empires constantly come to naught?

Some commentators suppose that the destroying blow is not yet given, since the kingdoms of this world have not yet fallen before the kingdom of our God. They view the Stone as still rolling down the mountain. They postpone the moment of collision till the end of this dispensation, when all opposing forces will have been swept away. This does not agree with the terms of the vision. The blow is given while as yet the kingdom of God is but a solitary Stone; it is by growth only that the Stone becomes a mountain. We may well understand an interval during which the Image, smitten only on its feet, still stands erect, apparently untouched, and answering thus to the apparent stability for a time of earthly kingdoms, though already doomed to destruction.

This kingdom of God, let us mark, is set forth as a kingdom against kingdoms. Yet it is not that of the sacred land. It is not the monarchy which had been destroyed in Jerusalem that will be re-established. It is not the throne of David which overturns these other thrones; or the throne of Solomon which outshines their splendour. It is no earthly kingdom, however sacred, no visible city of God which out-tops the Babylons of the world. It is something new, something wholly unlike any previous form of power. Apparently it is among the weak things of the world—as an untrimmed, unsquared stone, which a builder would refuse, yet, if chosen of God, is living and precious, fit to become the corner-stone of a glorious temple. Such a use of it here however would not be consonant with the

purpose of the vision. No great building arises on the site of the destroyed statue. Such an ending would have injured the force of the contrast between God's work and man's work. The shapeless Stone changes, the dreamer sees not how. He dreams through ages, though he knows it not. In that sleep a thousand years are but as a watch in the night, and, behold, the Stone has become a mountain!—a mountain dimly vast, whose base fills the earth, whose top reaches unto heaven! How grandly does this set forth that kingdom which is altogether a Divine creation!

But however unlike earthly kingdoms, it is still a kingdom, which is foreshown to Nebuchadnezzar. As such it agrees with his ideas of power, and commends itself to his understanding. But it is a Divine purpose. That which appeared in the fulness of time was invariably declared to be a kingdom, an ordered rule—the rule of a King who, if He came at first without form or comeliness, despised and rejected, “is yet a King, who shall reign until all enemies are put under His feet.” So also the conquering power of this kingdom is specially set forth in this vision given to a conqueror. That is what he would expect in a new kingdom; it must overthrow and take the place of its predecessors. But how unlike in its warfare to the kingdoms he has known is that which he beholds! How like to the kingdom which was to come!

That prefigured destruction of kingdoms certainly does not imply the dissolution of order and authority in human affairs. These were recognised as of Divine purpose, even in the despotic rule of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors. Nevertheless Babylon remained the centre and type of influences inimical to the people of God—the people amongst whom that kingdom of heaven was to be established—and was subjected to the Divine judgments accordingly. In so far as the kingdoms of this world are antagonistic to the kingdom of God in principles or in practice, they are exposed

to its destroying power, not otherwise. And in that respect we may believe that, not kingdoms only, but all institutions based solely upon human conceptions, formed only for human aggrandisement, associated in any degree with falsehood, injustice, lust, oppression, cruel force,—all systems of thought alien to the Divine Mind share in the irremediable defeat. There needs but a stone to roll down from the mountain of God's truth, that holy hill of Zion, that mountain of the Lord's house established in the top of the mountains, and, behold, the towering but baseless fabrics fall into fragments, and are ready to vanish away!

May we extend the parable still further? Is it fanciful to discover in that ruthless dominion of science which distinguishes our era, that supremacy of intellect, that brilliance of achievement apart from moral progress, an apt resemblance to the head of gold—now apparently serenely secure, but whose downfall as the supreme arbiter in human affairs may arise from that “foolishness of God which is wiser than man”? So may not the silver of a refined but irreligious civilization, the brass of social distinction, the iron of despotism, when opposed to the Divine kingdom, be brought to naught before those “weak things, and things which are despised, which God hath chosen to confound the things which are mighty”? In this sense the kingdom of God may still be but as a Stone that continually strikes and destroys.

This phase of the kingdom however is to pass away. The assailing Stone becomes a mountain, and like unto a mountain shall the kingdom at last be established upon everlasting foundations—“a kingdom that shall never be moved,” endowed with all the strength of the hills, girded with power, reposing in all the majesty of endless duration.

The kingdom, its days of warfare over, is to be a kingdom of peace. As the mountain clothed in beauty rises into the serene heaven, is bathed in the light of heaven, a vision

of rest and peace, so "the kingdom of God is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost"; its King is the Prince of peace.

The kingdom is to be a universal kingdom. All forms of power known to Nebuchadnezzar had their geographical limits. They were bounded by mountains or rivers. All religions were of local jurisdiction. The God of the Hebrews had been doubtless to Nebuchadnezzar but a tribal God; Bel Merodach had his special home in Babylon. The vision referred to a God of heaven, high above all, of whom the Babylonian king could have had but a dim conception; and to a kingdom which, like the mountain that filled the whole earth, should be wide as the cope of heaven above, wide as the world below.

To us it "has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." The Lord of that kingdom has likened it to leaven that, hid in an ephah, presently leavens the whole. He has likened it to a mustard seed which springs up into a mighty tree, upon whose branches the birds of the air make their lodging. He has told us that "the field is the world"; of seed cast into the earth that "groweth while a man sleeps, he knoweth not how," and of a great harvest. He has told us of His return after long absence to receive a kingdom. Of the glory and universality of that kingdom, prophets and apostles combine to assure us; and an angel announced that it should have "no end." What more perfect representation of that kingdom in its secret commencement, its peculiar conquering power, its eventual world-wide extension and glory, could have been given (if given in such a form at all) than in this ancient vision? Is it not a parable of which none could have been the author save Him who, when He appeared on earth, spake in parables?

But was there ever such a vision? Did the God of heaven of a truth reveal this thing to Nebuchadnezzar by

the mouth of His servant Daniel? or, does the whole story belong to what is termed "pseudepigraphical literature"? "It can hardly be denied" (says a popular writer), "when prejudice is quite laid aside, that the facts point to a very clear conclusion, *viz.* that the book of Daniel is one of a class, and differs in quality rather than in kind from other works of the same class—a class of writings which sprang up in the days of national resistance to Antiochus Epiphanes. It was characteristic of this class of writings to appear under the name of some distinguished personality, Enoch, Moses, the patriarchs, and so on. There was no intention to deceive, any more than Milton wished to deceive when he put some of the noblest thoughts that have ever been uttered into the mouths of the persons in *Paradise Lost*. The faithful servants of God, who were resisting the blasphemous tyranny of Antiochus, were strengthened in their noble struggle by the glowing stories and marvellously beautiful visions which had marked the life of the great Daniel in Babylon."

We are not here concerned with the authenticity of the book of Daniel, but since in the passage above it is plainly implied that Nebuchadnezzar's dream was only one of the "glowing stories" inserted in an altogether imaginative composition, we may be allowed a few words of comment. And for one thing, it is hard to understand how the servants of God could be strengthened in the struggle they were maintaining by what was an acknowledged and accepted invention of their own time! If, on the contrary, they believed the story to be a true record of a supernatural event such as had again and again occurred of old time in their nation's history; if they believed it to contain a genuine prediction, through one of the greatest of their seers, of an everlasting kingdom, superseding all other kingdoms, which the God of their fathers would set up;—they might well hold it as one of their strongest supports, little as they

might have understood its nature. "Noble thoughts," uttered only by one of themselves, would be of small avail. It was by the great *facts* of the past that their faith and hope could alone be sustained.

But not to dwell on this. Is it conceivable that so sublime a vision, with its profound spiritual significance, its far-reaching prophecy, even unto "the time of the end," was the invention of an age in which by common consent the prophetic function had ceased? Could it be the product of an age when creative genius had been succeeded by the imitative: of an age that lived on the past, and was busied only with compilation, the working up old materials, the elaboration of legend and marvel? Could it belong to an age that was obliged to cast its lucubrations in some ancient mould in order to attract attention and win respect? Could it belong to a set of writings which, from certain characteristics have for ages been considered devoid of authority, and among which it has not hitherto been classed? Lastly, was it appropriate to a time of desperate conflict with a heathen prince, to compose a story which makes a heathen potentate the depository of Divine secrets, and omits all reference to Jewish exaltation and conquest in the future? To put these questions is, it seems to us, to answer them. If we are to judge literature by the circumstances of its time, this story could not have belonged to the time of Antiochus.

On the other hand, the historical verity of the vision is not without confirmation when we remember the reported crisis of its occurrence. The visible kingdom of God had ceased, but, according to the story, it was immediately followed by a vision which points to a future invisible but most real kingdom of God—a restoration of the original theocracy, not in a limited and local, but in a universal sense, a completion thus of a great plan. This vision moreover is given to one, who, though the immediate destroyer

of the visible, historic throne, had become the custodian of the sacred people, one of whose seers interprets to him its meaning. It must needs therefore win for the captives unusual respect, while they, through their great representative, fulfil their ancient mission as depositaries of the Divine will, destined in due time to declare it to mankind.

It is a conclusion in harmony with the whole history of this people that this dream really visited the great Babylonian ruler, and that it was, with its interpretation, a true revelation of the counsels of God. No; we have not been sitting at the feet of a pseudepigraphical scribe, we have been listening to the eternal Word.

JOSIAH GILBERT.

ANCIENT CELTIC EXPOSITORS.

ST. COLUMBANUS AND HIS LIBRARY.

THE *Acta Sanctorum* form an unexplored mine of history, poetry, and romance. The historian finds there authentic records of life as lived amid the beginnings of European civilization. The poet can find there sweet songs—almost always of a sad and plaintive character; while as for romance and fable, they abound on every side. Among the romantic lives of the saints, those dealing with the Celtic missionaries stand pre-eminent. Fable, as we might expect, gathers thick round them. Adamnan's *Life of St. Columba* for instance, abounds with stories, fabulous indeed, but beauteous and touching withal. Romance too lends its charm, and among the most romantic lives, that of Columbanus, the apostle of Burgundy, Switzerland, and Italy, was the most striking and is the best authenticated. I have in another place sketched that career, beginning at

the monastery of Bangor in the County Down, and ending at Bobbio in Northern Italy.¹ To that sketch I must refer the reader desirous of knowing the facts of his chequered life, directing now my attention to Columbanus as he was an expositor of Scripture. Let us first realize his epoch and assign him a local place, a definite era in our minds. Columbanus belonged to the latter half of the sixth and earlier part of the seventh century, the age of Mahomet and of Gregory the Great, and is a connecting link between expositors of the school of St. Patrick in the fifth and Sedulius and writers of his type in the eighth and ninth centuries. We shall use our study of Columbanus to reflect light back upon the darker age to which St. Patrick belongs.

Columbanus was educated at the monastery of Bangor in the County Down, an institution which continued to flourish till long after English power was established in Ireland, though not a vestige of the ancient abbey now remains, and its very site is a disputed question.² As soon as he arrived at the years of manhood he was seized with a desire to propagate the gospel. Foreign missions were then the rage in the Celtic Church. Columba was evangelizing Scotland, and another Columba—for Columba, not Columbanus, was the real name of our saint—determined to pursue the same course in Central Europe.³ He left Bangor therefore with St. Gall and eleven other followers, preached with great success in Central Europe, and founded the monastery of Bobbio, not far from Genoa, among the mountains of the Apennine range in the year 612. From that date the Abbey

¹ See *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, chap. vii.

² Bishop Pococke, about the year 1750, describes some few fragments of the abbey then in existence. See his MS. tour in Ireland, now in the library of Trinity College, Dublin.

³ What a fine opportunity would have been here for a German rationalistic critic, had these two Columbas been first-century, and not sixth-century missionaries! How easily could their personality have been dissolved in the dove-like (Columba) spirit of the new religion which was spreading over the world!

of Bobbio became a great literary centre, and a chief witness to ancient Celtic culture and devotion to expository studies. As I do not know of any convenient account of this ancient Celtic monastery, I shall be pardoned if I describe its manuscript resources and its still existing remains at some considerable length, for they prove the learning of the ancient Celtic Church to have surpassed that of any other branch of contemporary western Christendom.

Bobbio was founded in 612. Its position—twenty-four miles S.W. from Piacenza in the valley of the Trebbia—is even still a lone and solitary one. Two centuries ago, when Mabillon visited it, he describes his journey thither as rough and difficult, over lofty mountains and through lonely valleys. And here, in passing, I may remark that with all our modern advances and discoveries, the true student will have much to learn from those chatty volumes, the *Diarium Italicum* and the *Iter Italicum* of the great French Benedictines Mabillon and Montfaucon. Sir James Stephen, in his *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, has given a very charming account of Mabillon and his literary tours; but it is only when one turns to the volumes themselves that we can at all realize the marvellous erudition of these monkish students, now so seldom consulted. The library of Bobbio is in some respects the most interesting, to us at least, in the world, for there we can learn the state of education and culture existing in our western islands more than one thousand years ago. Bobbio was founded by Celtic monks from Ireland, and during the first three centuries of its existence, down to the close of the ninth, it was continually replenished by Irish, or as they were then called, Scottish emigrants. We have too another most interesting point in connexion with Bobbio. Muratori, in the third volume of his great work on Italian antiquities, has preserved a catalogue of the Bobbio library, drawn up in the tenth century. It is a marvellous proof of the

erudition of the members of that monastery, filling several of Muratori's pages with lists printed in the closest possible order. The Irish monks were no narrow students; their minds ranged over every branch of literature. In their catalogue we find patristic literature, Greek and Latin, the works of Augustine, Athanasius, John Chrysostom, Eusebius, Hilary, Origen, and Cyprian; Latin and Greek historians, poets and orators, Homer, Virgil, Horace, Lucan, Juvenal, Cicero, Fronto; geographers, mathematicians, musicians; while they were not forgetful withal of the country whence they had come out, they were not forgetful or incurious about their own, but duly installed in the place of highest honour the works of their founder Columbanus, the Hymn-book of their parent monastery of Bangor, commonly called the Antiphonarium Benchorensis, the writings of Adamnan, the Abbot of Iona, and the encyclopædic volumes of the Venerable Bede. I have spoken of this library as still existing, and indeed its history is almost a romance. It continued to flourish all through the Middle Ages, preserving even in the darkest periods a flavour and reminiscence of its ancient culture. Its contents seem to have been frequently surveyed, as Peyron, in the beginning of this century, discovered another catalogue made in the year 1461, in addition to the tenth-century one already known. In the early years of the seventeenth century the library changed its locality. Cardinal Frederic Borromeo, a munificent patron of learning, was then presiding over the see of Milan. It was an age marked all over Europe by a devotion to studies and a prodigal liberality in their encouragement. Kings like our own James I. and Henry IV. of France pensioned learned men, such as Casaubon, that they might have time to prosecute their researches. Prelates like Laud and Ussher spent their revenues in scouring Oriental monasteries for ancient manuscripts, maintaining agents in Smyrna, Constantinople, and Alexandria for that purpose.

It is to that age we owe the discovery of some of our most valued treasures and the foundation of some of our greatest libraries. It was just the same in Italy, where Cardinal Borromeo spent vast sums in building the Ambrosian library, and furnishing it with books and manuscripts. With this end in view, he cast his eye upon Bobbio, bestowed rich gifts upon the monastery, and in exchange became possessor of the greatest portion of its famous library, leaving behind only about one hundred volumes, which Mabillon saw and inspected on the occasion of his visit to Bobbio. In the Ambrosian library the Bobbio collection was often visited during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Irish manuscripts were a puzzle to the antiquarians of the last century. The Celtic monks were good Latin and Greek scholars, but they, like many a modern student, often interspersed their books with marginal notes couched in the Irish language, glosses, explanations, prayers to favourite saints—especially St. Bridget—and notes upon even the most trivial matters, the time of day, the hour of dinner, or the state of the weather.¹ These Irish glosses and notes greatly puzzled French and German scholars. They ascribed them to the Anglo-Saxons, and called them Anglo-Saxon characters. They credited them to the Lombards, and never dreamt of tracing them to the right source. We, however, cannot wonder at this. The knowledge of Celtic is even now not widely spread. Fifty years ago its possessors could be counted on the fingers. A century and a half ago it was regarded as a barbarous jargon unworthy the attention of civilized men, devoid of a literature or of a history. Still something valuable was brought to light. Muratori discovered the Muratorian Fragment, the oldest historical witness to the gospel canon, copied by an Irish monk in the seventh century from some early Christian manuscript. He found, too, the

¹ See Zeuss, *Gram. Celt.*, præf., pp. xi., xii.

Bangor psalter, composed in the seventh century, whence the most popular hymn-book of the Church of England has derived the hymn, beginning—

“Draw nigh and take the Body of the Lord,
And drink the holy Blood for you outpoured,
Saved by that Body and that holy Blood,
With souls refreshed, we render thanks to God.”

The period of almost romantic discovery was, however, yet to come for the ancient Bobbio library. Cardinal Mai was one of the greatest scholars the Church of Rome has produced during this century. The volumes he published are well-nigh numberless. His various collections, in their very titles—the *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, the *Spicilegium Romanum*, and the *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*—sufficiently indicate the industry and learning of that eminent prelate. In later life he was the librarian of the Vatican. In earlier life he was the librarian of the Ambrosian library, where he made discoveries which give us a glimpse not only of the learning but also of the straits and poverty of the ancient Celtic monks, and show us at the same time what invaluable manuscript materials they possessed. While all Europe was convulsed by the Napoleonic wars, Mai was studying the Bobbio books, and in the course of his investigation ascertained that a good many of them were palimpsests. The Celtic monks in the seventh and eighth centuries were sorely in want of writing material. The supply of papyrus from Egypt had ceased since the Saracen conquest,¹ but they possessed a large supply of ancient books written on vellum. These they took, rubbed off the ancient writing, or washed it away, and then wrote their own Christian documents which they esteemed more important than the original text. The disciples of Columbanus must have been in sore distress when they thus treated some of their ancient books, for they preserved the vast majority

¹ See Scrivener's *Introduction*, p. 24.

most carefully. And some of them were very ancient and very precious too. Orations of Cicero, lost for ages to the modern world, were thus treated by the monks, and recovered by Mai. The monks took a Cicero originally written in the second or third century, and in the eighth century wrote over Cicero's brilliant periods, which they partially erased, the devouter sentiments of the Christian poet Sedulius, who flourished in the fifth. The works of Fronto were similarly treated, and similarly restored by the learned cardinal. Fronto was the friend, tutor, and associate of the imperial philosophers Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, with whom Fronto maintained a very lively correspondence. His letters were collected and published in a volume some time in the third or fourth century, a copy of which found its way to Bobbio. The monks of the eighth century had no special interest, however, in the correspondence of pagans, so they took the fourth-century volume, rubbed out the writing, and inserted instead a copy of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 457, which were of much more interest and importance to themselves. Mai's discoveries created a great sensation at the time. Great expectations were raised, and people thought they would have received most valuable light upon the history of the second century from the imperial and philosophic correspondence. The pure classical scholar, forgetting his vast obligations to the monks and the monasteries for all they had preserved, saw in their conduct a typical instance of narrowness and stupidity. And yet Wisdom was justified, in this instance at least, of her children, for when the letters were published they were found to be of almost trivial importance, and the judgment of the sons of St. Columbanus was amply vindicated. I cannot now indeed enlarge further on this point, which relates to the discovery of classical palimpsests, and belongs rather to the region of the *Classical Review* than to that of THE EXPOSITOR. The work, however, begun under Mai's

auspices, has been since continued, and of later years under the direction of Ceriani, Ascoli, and other learned men, has produced some remarkable results in various directions of scholarship. I may just mention for the advantage of the diligent student whose curiosity may have been aroused, that a very interesting account of Mai's discoveries will be found in the preface to that learned prelate's *Ciceronis Opera Inedita*, published some seventy or eighty years ago. One point, indeed, is plain and manifest, and it is a most important one. The Bobbio library in the seventh century possessed a number of documents dating back to the year 200 A.D., some of them classical, others of them sacred and ecclesiastical like the Muratorian Fragment, or rather the work of which it originally formed a part. If that could only be discovered what a treasure we should possess! The Bobbio library preserved for us in fact some remnants of the ancient libraries of North Italy. We often wonder what has become of all the gold and silver ever coined since money became current with the merchant. People often wonder what has become of all the books ever printed, and if they only knew the true state of the case, they would wonder even still more at what has become of all the libraries which existed in ancient times. It is a common notion that books were few and far between, because in ancient times there were no printing presses; while, on the contrary, books seem as a matter of fact to have been quite abundant. Every city and large town had a public library, some towns quite a number of such institutions. Every rich man's house was furnished with a library as a necessary part of its equipment, often as little used, and as really unnecessary as in more modern mansions. Seneca rebukes the rage of his day for heaping together a vast quantity of expensive books, "the very catalogues of which their owner has never read in his whole life"; while that bitter scoffer Lucian, a century later, laughs heartily at the uneducated rich for their

useless extravagance in this direction, in a treatise addressed *Πρὸς ἀπαίδευτον καὶ πολλὰ βιβλία ὀνούμενον*. Italy was in the first and second centuries filled with public libraries. Pliny in one of his charming letters tells us of a man who published his son's life, had an edition of a thousand copies struck off, and then distributed them gratis to all the libraries of Italy. What became of all these libraries and their contents? Making every allowance for fire and loss sustained through barbarian invasions, there must have been vast remains of these ancient collections still in existence when Columbanus founded the Bobbio library.¹

But here some one may naturally say, This is all very interesting as bearing on the classical learning of the Celtic monks, but what has it to do with them as students of Holy Writ and as expositors of its teachings? In reply I would say that I have brought forward these facts simply to establish the general culture of the ancient Celtic worthies, whose secular studies were never allowed to interfere with their devotion to sacred truth, for they were indefatigable in their multiplication of copies of Holy Scripture and of commentaries upon the same.² The followers and disciples of Columbanus were prominent in this great work, and modern learning owes much to their diligence. A

¹ On the subject of ancient libraries, the reader may consult an article on Pompeii, in *Journal des Savants* for July, 1881, p. 406.

² The culture of St. Columbanus himself must have been of a very extensive kind, as far at least as classical studies were concerned. His poems, for instance, as contained in all the collections of his works, and accessible in a handy shape in Migne's *Patrologia* or Fleming's *Collectanea*, abound in evidences of his scholarship. His first poem is an Epistle to a certain Hunaldus, one of his disciples. It contains thoughts and expressions drawn from Ovid, Horace, and Prudentius, though it measures only seventeen hexameter lines. The second poem contains allusions to Horace, Seneca, Prudentius, Juvenal, Ovid, Virgil. A study of the other poems, annotated as they have been by Sirmond and Canisius, will yield similar results, proving Columbanus to have been an accomplished classical scholar. Now as he did not leave Ireland upon his foreign mission till he was long past forty, he must have gained this knowledge under St. Comgall at the Abbey of Bangor, where the best classical authors must have been subjects of daily study in the middle of the sixth century.

glance at the Introduction to New Testament Criticism, published by Westcott and Hort, or by Scrivener, will amply prove this statement. They multiplied copies of the Scriptures in Latin and in Greek. The Monastery of St. Gall was founded by a member of the School of St. Columbanus—his disciple St. Gall, after whom it was called. To it we owe the celebrated Codex Sangallensis, still preserved in that monastery; and the Codex Boernerianus now at Dresden, which, however, is only a part of the St. Gall manuscript, this latter containing the Four Gospels, as the Dresden document the Epistles of St. Paul. To the Irish monastery of Reichenau, on the Lake of Constance, is due the Codex Augiensis, which, like the St. Gall MS., is a Greek uncial copy of the Epistles of St. Paul with a Latin version in parallel columns. The Bobbio monks devoted themselves to the multiplication of the Latin translation, such Celtic work being always distinguished, whether in these islands or abroad, by the beautiful capitals with which the writers interspersed their texts.¹ Some of these manuscripts—all of which come from about the same period, the seventh to the ninth centuries—contain most interesting marginal notices, illustrating the history of doctrines and doctrinal changes, or else giving us glimpses of the social life and habits of that distant time. St. Gall, for instance, was an intense Augustinian, and taught predestinarian views in the most extreme forms. He lived in the seventh century, but in the ninth century his followers, like certain moderns, had revolted from his teaching and gone over to the opposite party. This is manifest from some notes which the monks attached to various texts which the predestinarian party quoted in defence of their views or felt as difficulties, as for instance John xii. 39, 40, "Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded

¹ See for instance the Books of Durrow and Kells in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.

their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them," and on texts like Romans iii. 5, "But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?" 1 Corinthians ii. 8, "Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory," and 1 Timothy ii. 4, "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," which last of course constituted a difficulty to an Augustinian, because it asserts God's desire that all should be saved and come to eternal salvation.¹ Upon all these and several other verses the St. Gall scribes inserted marginal notes warning their readers against the heretical teaching of Gottschalk, the leader of the extreme predestinarian party in the ninth century. St. Gall's Monastery however has not been the only institution which has thus performed a theological somersault in the course of two centuries and quite reversed the teaching of its founders. All the Celtic monks, we must at the same time remember, did not follow the example of those of St. Gall; for Sedulius belonged to that period and still clung to the ancient Irish view, upholding an extreme Augustinianism which might have satisfied John Calvin or the fathers of the Westminster Assembly.

But the most interesting of the St. Gall notes is one in the document containing St. Paul's Epistles, now at Dresden. This manuscript was, as I have said, once in St. Gall's Monastery, where it was written by Irish monks, as appears from some curious Celtic lines contained therein, which Dr. Scrivener gives on p. 170 of his *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*. They are written in old Irish, and long puzzled the learned men of the Continent till a great Celtic scholar, the late Dr. John O'Donovan, the

¹ See Scrivener, *l.c.*, p. 151.

translator of the Four Masters into English, was consulted, when he at once explained their meaning. Dr. Scrivener gives O'Donovan's translation with corrections by Dr. Todd and the Rev. Robert King. The verses run thus in the English version :

“To come to Rome, to come to Rome,
Much of trouble, little of profit;
The thing thou seekest here,
If thou bring not with thee, thou findest not.

Great folly, great madness,
Great ruin of sense, great insanity,
Since thou hast set out for death,
That thou shouldest be in disobedience to the Son of Mary.”

These stanzas were written of course by an Irishman, for they are in the Irish language. Mr. King suggested that they were composed by an Irish bishop named Marcus, who went to Rome on a pilgrimage in company with his nephew Moengal. Upon their return from Rome they called at St. Gall, where the bishop and his nephew remained as residents, bestowing their books on the monastic library, and sending their servants and their horses home to Ireland. This however is a mere conjecture; the lines themselves give us facts.¹ They show us that pilgrimages to Rome were made by monks from Ireland in the eighth and ninth centuries. We know that it was just the same with the Celts two centuries earlier. St. Lasarian of Old Leighlin, Cummian a Columban monk, the author of a learned epistle on the Paschal question, still extant, both visited Rome in the first half of the seventh century. And the fashion of pilgrimage to the tombs of the Apostles Peter and Paul never died out in Ireland, though like many an Irishman since that time, the Celtic author of the stanzas quoted above seems to have returned very discontented

¹ The visit of the Celtic bishop and his nephew to St. Gall is an undoubted fact. It is mentioned by a contemporary chronicler, Ekkehardus. See Pertz, *Monumenta* ii., p. 78.

with his Roman visit.¹ He went to Rome doubtless as Luther did, expecting to find it the very centre and seat of holiness incarnate, and in his own emphatic language he found "to come to Rome much of trouble, little of profit." He went to Rome expecting to find God's presence and His peace there specially revealed. The ancient delusion was there dispelled for him that God draws nearer one place than another. Peace with God was at last realized by this ancient Celt as found in the islands of the ocean as readily as in the ecclesiastical capital of the West. The words, "The thing thou seekest here, if thou bring not with thee thou findest not," are an echo of the blessed teaching of the Master Himself to the Samaritan inquirer: "The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

GEORGE T. STOKES.

¹ The dedications of the ancient cathedral of Glendalough and of the monastery of Bobbio were the same, in honour of the Apostles Peter and Paul. The usual dedications of ancient Celtic churches were in honour of purely local Celtic saints.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Professor Joseph Agar Beet.	
Epaphroditus and the Gift from Philippi	64
Rev. Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D.	
The Epistle to the Hebrews:	
VI. The Way of Salvation	81
VII. Christ and Moses	161
VIII. The Gospel of Rest	272
IX. Christ not a Self-elected, but a God-appointed Priest	351
X. The Teacher's Complaint	415
Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.	
The Group of the Apostles:	
I.	100
II. Peter	187
III. The Minor Figures	434
Rev. F. H. Chase, M.A.	
Christian Interpolations in Jewish Writings	179
Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
Brevia:	
La Langue Parlée par N. S. Jésus-Christ sur la Terre	238
Rev. Professor S. Ives Curtiss, D.D., Ph.D.	
Recent Old Testament Literature in the United States .	235
Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.	
"Crowned with Glory and Honour"	115
Rev. Professor Franz Delitzsch, D.D.	
The Deep Gulf between the Old Theology and the New .	42
In Self-Defence: Critical Observations on my Hebrew New Testament:	
I.	135
II., III.	310

Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.

- Recent English Literature on the New Testament . . . 75, 316
 Farrar's *Lives of the Fathers* 232

Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.

- Notes on Three Passages in St. Paul's Epistles . . . 15
 The Double Text of Jeremiah 321

Ven. Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.

- The Last Nine Chapters of Ezekiel 1
 St. James the Apostle 241

Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, B.A.

- Jesus Crowned for Death 222

Josiah Gilbert.

- The Image and the Stone 449

Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D.D.

- Primitive Liturgies and Confessions of Faith . . . 401

Rev. Ed. G. King, D.D.

- The Hallel 121

Rev. Professor J. Rawson Lumby, D.D.

- Old Testament Criticism in the Light of New Testament
 Quotations 337

Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D.

- The Priesthood and Priestly Service of the Church . . 200

Joseph John Murphy.

- Two Parables 290

Rev. W. W. Peyton.

- The Bread Problem of the World, Our Lord's First
 Temptation 369

Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A.

- Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia: a Study in the
 Early History of the Church:

- III. 141
 IV. 253
 V. 392

Rev. F. Rendall, M.A.

- The Scriptural Idea of Priesthood embodied in Successive
 Types 24

Rev. T. G. Selby.

Professor Huxley and the Swine of Gadara	303
Brevia: Second Twilights and Old Testament Miracles	317

Rev. Professor George T. Stokes, D.D.

Ancient Celtic Expositors	461
-------------------------------------	-----

The Editor.

Professor Cheyne	55
----------------------------	----

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis vii. 18-20	131	Ezekiel xlv. 1-4	134
Exodus xix. 6	39	Daniel ii. 31	448
xxi. 6	343	iv. 23, 29	311
xxviii. 35, 43	71	xii. 2	313
xxix. 21	205	Hosca xiii. 14	134
Leviticus xvii.-xxvi.	9	Amos ix. 11, 12	344
Numbers xx. 17	16	Zechariah xii. 10	345
Joshua x. 12	318	Matthew iv. 3	369
2 Chronicles xxvi. 16-21	29	viii. 28	303
Job v. 13	345	ix. 9	445
xlii. 6	194	x. 2	103
Psalms viii.	341	x. 3	438, 439, 443
viii. 2	341	x. 4	435
xl.	25	x. 5	105
lxvi. 3	51	xii.	346
lxxviii. 18	20	xiv. 30	188
cxlii.-cxviii.	121	xv. 23	107
cxiv.	125	xvi. 15-17	195
cxv.	126	xvi. 16	110
cxvi.	129	xix. 27	290
cxvii.	131	xx. 16	240
cxxxiii.	313	xx. 22	248
cxxxix.	333	xxi. 16	340
Ecclesiastes iii. 11	313	xxvi. 27	121
Isaiah v. 1	134	xxvi. 39-44	131
vi. 5	194	xxvi. 42	130
xxxviii. 8	319	Mark iii. 16	103
Jeremiah	321	vi. 29	106
Ezekiel xl.-xlviii.	1	vii. 15	109

	PAGE		PAGE
Mark viii. 16	111	1 Cor. xv. 27	342
x. 32	104	2 Cor. iv. 13	131
xii. 43	108	viii. 1, 2	68
xiv. 41	248	xi. 6	407
xv. 47	244	xi. 9	68
Luke i. 1-4	401	Galatians i. 19	437
v. 5	188	ii. 20	46
vi. 13	70	iii. 16	18
vi. 14	103	Ephesians iii. 14	411
ix. 55	248	iv. 8	20, 349
xv.	311	Philippians i. 7, 13	64
xv. 11-32	290	i. 29	117
xxiv. 18	244	ii. 5-11	230
John i. 14	117	iii. 6	296
i. 40	440	iii. 20, 21	202
i. 43	442	iv. 10	66
i. 50	438	Colossians i. 24	212
iv. 6	104	1 Thessalonians iii. 11, 12	182
vi. 51	313	iv. 2	406
vii. 5	244	v. 8	184
xii. 22	441	2 Thessalonians ii. 1-12	180
xiv. 8	443	ii. 6	182
xv. 5	200	1 Timothy iii. 9	412
xv. 15	105	2 Timothy iii. 8	403
xvii. 18	201	Hebrews ii. 3-9	342
xix. 25	244	ii. 5-9	222
xix. 27	245	ii. 9	115
xix. 37	345	ii. 11-18	81
xxi. 17	189	iii.	161
xxi. 18	188	iv.	272
Acts i. 13	103	v. 1	24
iv. 13	188	v. 1-10	351
v. 41	117	v. 5	36, 121
vi. 4	405	v. 10	39
vi. 7	401	v. 7, 8	131
xiii. 12	401	v. 11-14	415
xv.	343	vi. 1-8	415
xv. 6	405	ix. 28	131
xv. 26	404	x. 14	40
xviii. 25	401	x. 19-22	204
xix. 19	402	xi. 40	39
Romans ii. 17	410	James i. 5	293
viii. 2	46	2 Peter i. 16	117
1 Cor. iii.	349	1 John v. 17	298
iii. 19	345	Revelation xiv. 13	281
x. 4	15	xxi. 4	281
xiii. 2	409		